DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 770 AC 012 753

AUTHOR	Newell, Howard J.; And Others
TITLE	Attitudes of County Leaders toward Expanding Youth Programs in Extension.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Agricultural Extension Service.
REPORT NO	SR-32
PUB DATE	Mar 69
NOTE	53p.; Minnesota Extension Study 2
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Adult Programs; *Extension Agents; *Extension Education; Leadership; Program Development; *Questionnaires; *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

The study of attitudes of various leaders in Extension toward the particular aspects of change in 4-H programs is reported on. This study grew from the need to identify counties where the various types of new program expansion would be favorably viewed in the early developmental stages. A questionnaire was mailed to 1,045 county leaders, with followup letters later. The questionnaire was based on interest in various types of expansion, including adult programs. It was found that the attitude toward an exchange of work in the youth program is highly favored by county leaders. Also, over half of the county leaders actively favored expanding the youth program. (CK)

ED 065770

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Special Report 32 March 1969

MINNESOTA EXPANSION STUDY II

attitudes of county leaders toward expanding youth programs in extension

Howard J. Newell, Charles E. Ramsey, and Duane A. Wilson

Agricultural Extension Service • University of Minnesota

AC 12 173

Howard J. Newell is associate professor, district supervisor, county Extension work; Charles E. Ramsey, professor, Department of Sociology and Extension sociologist; and Duane A. Wilson, associate professor, district supervisor, county Extension work.

Issued in furtherance of cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics, acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Roland H. Abraham, Director of Agricultural Extension Service, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101.

4M — 1-69

ERRATA

County	Table	Page								Correct		
			Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	
			Grain			Livestock			Homemaking		
Marshall	1A	13	81.8	18.2	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	63.6	27.3	9
									Safety		
Redwood	1B	19							100.0	0.0	0
			Outdoor			Other Animals			Safety		
Kandiyohi	1B	21	45.5	36.4	18.2	9.1	54.5	36.4	75.0	25.0	0
			Adults			Development			Self-Understand		
Marshall	1C	23	70.0	30.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10
						Awards Program					
Total	2A	28				41.8	35.6	22.6			
			Rural 9-12			Urban/Village 9-12			Rural Teenage		
Wright	3A	36	80.0	20.0	0.0	36.4	54.5	9.1	70.0	20.0	10
Wadena	4A	38									
						Church			Scouts		
Lac Qui Parle	4A	39				33.3	25.0		41.7	41.7	16

You may make the corrections in your bulletin and discard this page or keep it, as y

ERRATA

Corrected Percentages

ral No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
		Livestock			Homemaking			Plants							
0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	18.2	81.8	0.0						
					Safety										
				100.0	0.0	0.0									
		Other Animals			Safety			Manual Skills			Special Interest			Earning Skills	
18.2	9.1	54.5	36.4	75.0	25.0	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	27.3	54.5	18.2	70.0	20.0	10.0
		Development			Self-Understanding			Marriage							
0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	45.5	27.3	27.3						
		Awards Program													
	41.8	35.6	22.6												
12		Urban/Village 9-12			Rural Teenage			Urban/Village Teen			Youth 7-8				
0.0	36.4	54.5	9.1	70.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	10.0	20.0	70.0			
								FF and FH			Farm Org.			Civic Org.	
								9.1	9.1	90.9	9.1	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0
		Church			Scouts			FF and FH			Farm Org.			Civic Org.	
	33.3	25.0		41.7	41.7	16.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	41.7	33.3	25.0

tin and discard this page or keep it, as you wish.

ATTITUDES OF COUNTY LEADERS TOWARD EXPANDING YOUTH PROGRAMS IN EXTENSION: MINNESOTA EXPANSION STUDY II

Howard J. Newell, Charles E. Ramsey, Duane A. Wilson

"Children now love luxury. They have bad manners, contempt for authority. They show disrespect for elders, and love to chatter in places of exercise. Children are now tyrants, not the servants of their households." This quote is not from a current criticism of modern American youth, although it might well be. These words were from Socrates, describing the youth of ancient Athens before the time of Christ. Indeed, throughout history, we find the criticism of youth consisting of much the same theme--disrespectful, lazy, and irresponsible.

Perhaps the only distinctive feature of the modern concern with youth is the greater dependence placed upon institutions other than the family in helping children become adults. The school has taken over most of the waking hours of youth, especially since school-assigned homework captures much of the time spent at home. Peers are also extremely important in determining youth's interests and values. Scouting, 4-H, and similar organizations occupy many hours of those youth who find the meetings an arena for peer association and interesting activity.

Thus, we find that adults today are as critical of youth as they ever were, but on the other hand we find a preoccupation with "programing" for youth development.

The 4-H movement has not escaped the pressure to provide ever-increasing scope and intensity in programing for youth development. Suggestions for expanded youth programs have come from within the Extension organization as well as from persons not directly connected with Extension.

The proposals for expansion in 4-H have taken many directions, but those now being most seriously discussed and tried in some counties in the United States deal with changes in content, method, and audience.

Changes in content came first. New projects, such as career choice, motors, and bicycle clubs were added to the traditional agricultural and homemaking program content. Old projects were sometimes given a different slant. For example, added to parliamentary procedure and demonstration in the junior leadership project was such supporting subject matter as self-understanding and group dynamics.

Changes in method have long been discussed, but, with few exceptions, tried only recently. Experts on youth development have seriously questioned traditional methods, such as competition and ribbons, completing records, and exhibiting; but essentially the methods have withstood these attacks. The appointment of a teenager as the club leader has been tried in a few counties in some states. More recently, shorter projects have been tried in several pilot counties, with the yearlong requirement reduced to only a few meetings, mainly in the summer.

Changes in audience or clientele have, in some counties, become an accomplished fact. Urban and village youth are being reached in fairly large numbers. Another proposal has been made to lower the club membership age to include 7- and 8-year-old youth. Greater emphasis on programs for teenagers has also been suggested since there is a heavy dropout at the beginning of the teen years.

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

This special report tells of a study of attitudes of various leaders in Extension toward the particular aspects of change in 4-H programs discussed here. Specifically the study concerns various types of content in short term projects, selected methods to be used in handling these projects, and a general question of new clientele and new emphasis with teenagers.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

In Minnesota, community 4-H Clubs consist of boys and girls from ages 9 to 19, living in a community or area of a particular county. The club can develop an achievement program by fulfilling requirements for a National 4-H Charter received: when the group has at least five members enrolled in a project, an organization with the necessary officers, one or more local leaders, and a constitution and bylaws. An achievement seal can be added each year if the club holds at least nine regular meetings, has a local achievement day, picnic, camp or tour; has representation at a county achievement day or county fair; and on project completion by at least 85 percent of its members. The traditional approach to 4-H in Minnesota has been that members from age 9-19, belong to a community 4-H Club, and enroll in one or more of the approved projects. The 4-H year is from October 1 through September 30. There is emphasis on enrollment during October and November, although a club member can enroll as late as May 1. The members enroll in one of the approved projects and keep a record of their work for a stated period of time. Members are strongly urged to keep these records; some clubs require completion of records as a criterion for reenrollment. Members are urged to participate in all activities, such as exhibiting or demonstrating at the county fair or county achievement day. Members competing are eligible for many county, state, and national awards.

In recent years many people have suggested the Extension Service expand youth programs. It is said these educational programs should be developed to meet the needs of a new and larger youth clientele. One way to expand would be with short term projects. The teaching time is indefinite, but is usually shorter than the traditional 4-H Club year. For example, the project may call for 10 hours of instruction, or may be organized for one meeting a week for a few weeks. The project might also be organized for any number of meetings, 4, 8, or 12, over 2-3 months. Projects are most often made available during the summer months, but they can be offered any time.

Participants in this educational program may or may not be members of an organized community 4-H Club. Perhaps their group is interested in a particular subject. For this program the members may be asked to keep a 4-H record. In Minnesota, members of short term projects are considered to be 4-H members even though they do not participate in the traditional awards program.

In December 1965, a pilot project involving short term projects and called 4-H Operation Expansion was introduced in 21 counties in six states. Beltrami, Dakota, and Redwood counties were involved in this project in Minnesota. The major purpose of 4-H Operation Expansion was to demonstrate how a larger number of boys and girls can be reached through Extension 4-H with the present staff. Specific objectives selected were (1) to increase the number of youth contacted through 4-H programs; (2) to develop new approaches to conducting 4-H programs; (3) to contact more youth without increasing agent time or staff; (4) to revise the structure of the traditional 4-H program; and (5) to cut time spent by the agents on administrative details.

Suggestions for this change of programing and organization of youth work in the Extension Service came from many sources. Nationwide, some counties had already used one or more of the methods suggested in Operation Expansion to reach 4-H goals and objectives. Legislators and other leaders were asking the Extension Service to expand and change to reach a larger number of youth and make programs available to urban and nonfarm youth. Ultimately, the development of the pilot project became the responsibility of the 4-H Department of the Federal Extension Service.

Following are some examples of short term projects used in the three counties participating in Minnesota:

Beltrami	Dakota
Resort help training	Bicycle care
Charm school	Family life program
Bicycle safety	Outdoor cookery
Knitting	Home gardening
Money management	Farm tours--city youth
Family life education	
Life career game	

Redwood

Conservation	Outdoor cookery
Creative foods	Babysitting

THE POPULATION OF THE STUDY

This study grew from the need to identify counties where the various types of new program expansion would be viewed favorably in the early developmental stages. Since much of the planning is done on the county level, there is no demand for unformity statewide. Therefore, it was thought important to determine the attitudes of county leaders toward various types of expansion. For state planning, a sample of leaders would have been sufficient, but for county planning it was necessary to obtain data from all county leaders in the state who are officially responsible for the approval of Extension budgets and programs.

County leaders in this study include all members of the County Board of Commissioners, the County Auditor, and all appointed members of the Extension Committee. An interview would have been ideal in eliciting qualifying statements, but the large number of county leaders made this research tool prohibitive in cost. Instead, a questionnaire was mailed to each of the 1,045 county leaders defined here, with followup letters later. The response to the questionnaire was unusually high, compared with other studies employing the mailed questionnaire: 968 of the county leaders returned a completed questionnaire making the response rate 92.7 percent.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The development of the questionnaire was based on the interest in various types of expansion, including adult programs. The section of the questionnaire devoted to expansion in youth programs included questions on changes in the 4-H program which were discussed in the early paragraphs of this special report. Questions on short term projects, various methods of recognition such as trips, awards, and completion, new emphases in age and residence groups, and attitudes toward coordinating with other agencies concerned with youth, were asked in the first two pages of the questionnaire. Questions in the later sections were devoted primarily to issues in expanding adult programs, but some youth-related programs included the exchange of work between county staff members, and the use of specialists.

THE ANALYSIS

Since the main purpose of this special report is to help in county 4-H program planning, the data for counties are most important. These data are presented in the appendix. Each county leader's response is given equal weight in the computation of percentages in each attitude column. The inclusion of commissioners who are not presently on the Extension Committee is based on the rationale that the total Board of Commissioners must approve the budget and, indirectly, the general program of Extension.

The state totals, discussed in the text of this special report, are intended as general perspectives on the attitudes of county leaders in Minnesota. These totals should allow a comparative basis for defining directions in program planning at the county level, as well as providing a background for statewide considerations.

The findings do not represent a final vote on 4-H expansion. The questionnaire was sent out in the winter of 1968 before many of these proposals had been discussed by the county leaders. Findings are intended to serve as a basis for discussion in county planning.

The significance of opposition is of utmost importance in interpreting findings. Extension personnel are strongly encouraged in training and in the actual operation of the organization to work on consensus in program development, rather than on simple majority vote. The authors of this special report considered an opposition of 20 percent or more to any expansion proposal, of social significance in the county, warranting much discussion before a proposal is adopted. A full discussion of this is presented in the previous special report of this study. *

THE FINDINGS

In the following pages, the attitudes of county leaders toward various proposals for expansion in the 4-H program are reported statewide. Corresponding tables for the individual counties are in the appendix.

THE CONTENT OF SHORT TERM PROJECTS

Fourteen attitude questions were used on the first regular page of the questionnaire to elicit attitudes toward the content for short term projects. Five of the questions deal with traditional project areas where the only change involved is the method of teaching: especially the length of time the project is conducted. Another five questions deal with special interest group program areas, some of which have been included in regular yearlong programs and others not. These are essentially skill projects. The remaining four areas relate more directly to human relations and human development.

TRADITIONAL PROGRAM AREAS

The county leaders were asked to express attitudes toward the inclusion of grain crops among the short term projects in expanded youth programs. The examples used in the questionnaire were corn, soybeans, and small grain. These examples represent traditional 4-H projects. Corn was the first Minnesota 4-H project. Soybeans, of more recent economic importance, is the subject of a regular project which follows the traditional 4-H project format. The basic requirements for the grain crops projects include growing 1 acre or more of a crop and keeping a complete record from seedbed preparation through harvest and sale.

In responding to the question of including grain crops as short term projects, the attitudes of the county leaders could be influenced in different ways. A desire to maintain the traditional program and to reach only rural young people could produce a negative response. A negative response might also result from a feeling that projects in this area should provide a learning experience which would encourage young people to remain on the farm and that the yearlong requirement would be needed to accomplish this. A favorable attitude of some county leaders might be influenced by a broader view of expanded educational programs taken by county leaders who are more closely aligned with the urban population or who might feel that a larger clientele should be reached.

A second traditional program area proposed as a short term project is the study of livestock. The examples given for this project were beef, dairy, and swine--traditional projects in the Minnesota 4-H youth program. Its objectives are to teach boys and girls to become successful livestock producers and to increase livestock production in the state. The basic requirements for the project are to own and raise one or more head of livestock and to keep a complete record of the project. The project length varies from 3 months for one phase of the swine project to 1 year for dairy and beef. These projects receive strong support from the livestock industry and many awards are available for participants.

The close relationship of many of the county leaders to the livestock industry could influence the response to the question of including the study of livestock in a short term project. Some may feel the importance of this industry to the economy of the state would be downgraded by a change in the 4-H projects. Some might find it difficult to see how livestock projects could be developed into short term projects if a person is to own and raise an animal. Those expressing an affirmative attitude could be influenced by a desire to reach a larger clientele and to provide a learning experience for boys and girls who may never farm or who do not live on a farm. A favorable response could also come from those who feel that Extension could provide a valuable learning experience for young people without the need to own or raise an animal.

The county leaders were also asked to express attitudes toward including homemaking skills as short term projects in expanded youth programs. The examples given for these projects were cooking, sewing, and home management--all part of the very early development of the 4-H youth program. The basic objective in the homemaking skills area is to teach preservation and preparation of foods produced on the farm, making of clothing, and management of the home.

*Duane A. Wilson, Howard J. Newell, and Charles E. Ramsey, "Attitudes of County Leaders Toward Expanded Adult Programs in Extension," Special Report 31, University of Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service, 1969.

The fact that this was the first project area with participation by urban young people may influence the attitude of the county leaders. Early records show that the majority of urban or nonfarm youth participating in these 4-H programs were girls. County leaders whose attitude was negative in the first two questions might be more inclined to be neutral or even to give an affirmative response toward including these projects in a short term program. A negative response could result from the feeling that the primary emphasis in 4-H should be returned to the rural young person.

County leaders were asked to express attitudes toward including plants as short term projects in expanding youth programs. Examples used to describe projects of this type were landscaping and gardening. These have been a part of the 4-H program many years, but have changed from the basic objective of producing food for the farm kitchen and providing better surroundings for the farm home. Many boys and girls can participate in these projects. The increased enrollment during World War II, especially in the victory garden project, and the failure to maintain this enrollment could influence the response of some county leaders familiar with this situation.

County leaders were asked to express attitudes toward including manual skills, such as electronics, mechanics, and shop, as short term projects in expanded youth programs. The general purposes of the projects are to provide a learning experience for young people in caring for and understanding use of tools common to the farm and home shop, understanding electricity and its use, and making articles common to the farm and home. These projects require a record and report of work done, similar to all regular 4-H Club projects. It is also possible for the members to have an exhibit for the county fair or achievement day.

Records are often not required for short term projects, and often short term project members do not exhibit at the county fair or achievement day. County leaders could be influenced to have a negative attitude where they felt strongly toward records and exhibiting. The fact that all young people could participate in these short term projects could also influence the response. There has been greater participation in these projects by urban young people than in the agricultural projects employing traditional methods. This could influence some county leaders. In other words, responses to including traditional project topics in short term projects could be influenced as much by the resistance to change in method and clientele as to the time change for traditional projects.

The data of this study show there is extremely little opposition, among county leaders of the state, to the inclusion of the traditional areas of the 4-H program in the short term projects (see table 1). If only the attitudes of county leaders were considered in this proposal for expansion, the introduction of short term projects in traditional areas could proceed in most counties with little further discussion.

There are some interesting patterns in the county data, however, (see table 1A in the appendix) many counties in the Northeast district have a significant opposition to the inclusion of grain crops as short term projects. In all other districts, only a very few counties expressed significant opposition--but in those few, it was very heavy opposition.

There was dramatic response in the counties to including homemaking skills as short term projects. In only one county were more than 15 percent of the counties' leaders opposed. Few proposals in the entire questionnaire received such universal acceptance.

Opposition to including plants and livestock as short term projects was much more scattered and a large percentage of county leaders were neutral. There was generally favorable statewide response to these traditional projects.

SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP PROGRAM AREAS

The county leaders were asked to express their attitudes toward including outdoor projects, such as cooking, day camps, nature hikes, and hunting. These examples are parts or phases of regular 4-H projects or activities with member participation. Each of the examples listed as short term projects, with the exception of hunting, was carried out as part of the pilot project, 4-H Operation Expansion. They were developed to provide a learning experience for all interested young people and could be available to regular 4-H members or to those participating only in short term projects.

A second topic was including the study of animals, other than livestock, as short term projects in expanded youth programs. Examples for this project were dogs, rabbits, and horses, all regular 4-H projects, with the dog project the newest and the rabbit project part of the program for over 25 years. A horse project, one of the earlier ones, was dropped after the tractor replaced the horse as the power unit on farms. The horse project was redeveloped in the mid-fifties when statewide interest increased in pleasure horses.

County leaders were also asked to express attitudes toward the inclusion of short term projects on safety as part of expanded youth programs. The examples used were water safety, guns, bicycles, and automobiles. Safety education has been carried out as a part of the Extension 4-H youth program in the 4-H Safety and Fire Prevention Project and is a part or phase of many other projects. These examples also lend themselves to short instructional periods and support the activities of special interest groups.

County leaders were asked to express attitudes toward the inclusion of hobby-type special interests as short term projects in expanded youth programs. The examples of special interest projects given in the questionnaire were photography,

painting pictures, and crafts. Photography has been included as a regular 4-H project for a number of years and painting and crafts have long been considered Extension activities in some states. Participation in these programs was usually conducted as part of a 4-H camp or other 4-H special event. These groups could be made up of members participating in the regular 4-H program or they might be individuals who do not belong to a 4-H Club or who are not involved in one of the regular projects.

The county leaders were asked to express attitudes toward inclusion of earning skills as short term projects in expanded youth programs. The examples used, babysitting, part-time jobs, summer jobs, are a departure from traditional 4-H projects and are more closely aligned with those commonly accepted as possible short term projects. As indicated earlier, short term projects of this nature were developed in each of the counties involved in the pilot project, 4-H Operation Expansion. Such topics are not new to 4-H programs since they have been a part of other projects.

There is a wide range of underlying attitudes that might influence the response to these special interest group areas. A favorable response to the development of short term projects could come from the feeling that most of these special interests more nearly correspond to the needs of non-farm youth than do the more traditional projects. The favorable response could also be due more to the desire for new audiences than for new content. A second underlying attitude which could bring a favorable response is the feeling that these special interest group areas even meet the needs of farm children since so many of them do not become farmers--thus a futuristic attitude. Still a third underlying attitude eliciting a favorable response could be the feeling that hobby interests are legitimate content for youth programs, possibly based on the old fears of "idle hands." However, negative response also could be based on the definition of these special interest group areas as "play," thus not warranting a tax-sponsored program. Another definition leading to negative responses would be the feeling that most, if not all, of these special interest activities are not socializing the youth into the productive economic system. There are features of some of the questions which might produce results unique to that question, such as the wide range of "other animals" listed as examples. A person might easily respond to a particular example which he or she likes or dislikes, rather than to the general idea of short term projects on animals other than livestock.

Responses of county leaders to the inclusion of special interest group projects in the short term project program is, on the whole, favorable, but less so than in the traditional areas (see table 1). A significant opposition is found in two of the proposed areas: those concerned with animals other than livestock, and what is termed special interests--photography, painting pictures, and crafts. Even in these two latter areas, however, there was general approval in many counties (see table 1B).

There is much more predominance of neutral responses to some of the special interest group areas than to the traditional projects. Only safety projects receive heavy support, indeed heavier than any of the traditional areas.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AREA

The choice of human development program areas is especially problematic. The rapidly increasing orientation towards human relations in American culture appears in practically every institution. Churches are sponsoring sociological and economic workshops for ministers and are increasing learning experiences not directly concerned with man's relation to God but more with man's relation to man. The economic institution has moved toward a human relations orientation in providing contracts for fringe benefits, in devoting high level offices to community relations, and in devoting increasing proportions of research and development efforts to human relations within the industry. In government, there is an increasing proportion of legislation and executive personnel devoted to human relations problems, such as civil rights. Public schools have sociology and psychology courses, as well as an increased number of counselors. The number of college sociology and psychology majors is increasing.

All this points to the direction of the major culture theme in American society as human relations oriented. However, the small community and the farm segment of the population show some evidence of resisting or being bypassed by the system.

County leaders were asked to express attitudes toward the inclusion of understanding adults as short term projects in expanded youth programs. Examples for this program area were youth relations with parents and teachers. This question and the following three have an orientation toward human relations and human development. The examples given for this question represent a part of a series of educational meetings held for teenagers in a number of counties. They have never been considered as projects requiring a record or a lengthy participation in the program. County leaders' attitudes could be influenced by the fact that these projects are for teenagers only, and some county leaders might feel 4-H should be mainly for the 9-12 age group. Some county leaders could also feel that these educational programs are the responsibility of others, such as the school, the church, or the family.

County leaders were asked to express attitudes toward the inclusion of personal development as short term projects in expanded youth programs. The examples used were citizenship, leadership, and career choice, all having a closer relationship to the regular 4-H program than other proposed areas in human development. Citizenship short courses have been conducted by Extension; a junior leadership program has been available to members for many years, and Extension staff has carried out programs on career choice. Each of the examples given lends itself to educational programs of

short duration and could be appealing to the teenage group. They could also interest rural, rural nonfarm, and urban teenagers. County leaders could view these short term projects as good for all teenagers--resulting in an affirmative response. Negative responses could come from the general feeling that such topics are inappropriate for 4-H short term projects either because such topics are best left unstudied, because they belong to other institutions, or because they belong in year-long projects.

Another topic related to human relations and human development is self-understanding. In designing this question, it was assumed that self-understanding is greatly enhanced by self-acceptance, which in turn can start in projects on grooming and clothes selection. Again, these examples are closely related to phases of the Extension 4-H program. For example, educational programs on good grooming were made available to club members some years ago, and a contest was held. Selection of clothes was part of the good grooming program and the clothing project. County leaders might view this in a number of ways which would influence their attitudes toward these short term projects. It is possible some might feel that this should remain a part of the traditional and ongoing program and that it should be available only to those who participate as regular 4-H members. Others might feel this educational program should be made available to all teenagers in a community --thus their attitude would be in the affirmative.

County leaders were asked to express their attitude toward including preparing for marriage as short term projects in expanded youth programs. Examples used in the questionnaire were dating and teenage marriage which lend themselves to educational programs which can be carried out over a short time, require no record, and have a limited possibility of any type of exhibit at the end of the program. The attitudes of county leaders could be influenced by their feelings of Extension's responsibility in providing these programs for teenagers. In this question, as well as the preceding three questions, county leaders might be influenced by their feelings toward expansion of the Extension youth program to include a larger number of interested young people or whether to limit it only to those participating in the regular 4-H program.

The data show that the response of the county leaders to including human development areas in short term projects is, in general, favorable (see table 1). There was significant opposition only in the area of preparing for marriage where fewer than half of the county leaders were actively favorable.

In no county was personal development as a short term project opposed by as many as 20 percent of the county leaders. However, there were a few counties with 16 or 17 percent opposition, and it would appear that agents should discuss the proposal with county leaders in these counties before these projects are attempted.

Table 1. One way to expand is through short term projects, in which youth meet on a special topic for only a few meetings. These meetings may be discussions, workshops, or projects. If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Subject for short term project	Yes	Neutral	No
Traditional subjects			
Grain crops (corn, soybeans, and small grain)	61.0	32.0	7.0
Livestock (beef, dairy, swine)	75.7	20.6	3.7
Homemaking skills (electronics, mechanics, shop)	76.0	21.2	2.8
Plants (landscaping, gardening)	40.8	49.7	9.5
Special interest subjects			
Outdoor projects (cooking, day camps, nature hikes, hunting)	47.4	40.6	12.0
Other animals (dogs, rabbits, horses)	17.7	54.3	28.0
Safety (water, gun, bicycle, automobile)	82.1	13.2	4.7
Manual skills (electronics, mechanics, shop)	50.9	37.9	11.2
Special interest (photography, painting pictures, crafts)	23.2	56.2	20.6
Earning skills (babysitting, part-time jobs, summer jobs)	49.1	41.7	9.2
Human development and relations			
Understanding adults (relations with parents, teachers)	67.8	24.5	7.7
Personal development (citizenship, leadership, career choice)	78.5	17.9	3.6
Self-understanding (grooming, selection of clothes)	52.5	38.3	9.2
Preparing for marriage (dating, teenage marriage)	46.8	36.6	16.6

In all other areas of human development programs, there was significant opposition in some counties, and this was not concentrated in any one district of the state.

The human development areas in the questionnaire were indicated for teenagers only. The subjects listed as examples are generally much more appropriate for teens than for younger children. Greater emphasis would probably aid in recruiting new teenage members and would encourage teenage members to remain in 4-H. (See county data in tables 1A, 1B, and 1C in the appendix.)

METHODS IN THE SHORT TERM PROJECT

Traditionally, certain methods have been central to the 4-H movement, including exhibiting at the county fair, awarding ribbons to differentiate degrees of excellence, completing project records and awarding scholarships. These methods appear to be strongly favored by many parents of 4-H members, as well as by members themselves. Agents report many difficulties with awards, but still seem to support the idea strongly.

Some students of the socialization process have criticized these methods saying that competition is not as wholesome an educational motivator as cooperation, and that awards make the satisfaction in learning extrinsic rather than intrinsic. There are, internationally, 4-H organizations which do not use the award system.

The problematic nature of associating the usual methods with short term projects flows not only from the nature of the disagreement mentioned but also from certain practical difficulties. Many of the short term projects do not adapt easily to exhibiting or awards. Some of these projects last too short a time to develop artifacts worthy of exhibiting; while others simply have no artifacts associated with the project, as in discussion sessions on youth relating to adults.

If exhibiting and awarding prizes are impossible in some short term projects, this raises the question of whether the methods should be used in any. The county leaders were asked to check their attitude toward some of these methods as they relate to the short term project.

In considering the traditional methods listed in table 2 as appropriate for short term projects, there was little opposition to and a heavily favored response for competition at the fair, giving awards for excellence, and keeping project records. Opposition reached a socially significant level only in a few counties. As mentioned earlier, some of the areas listed on the questionnaire as potentially appropriate for short term projects would not lend themselves to any of these three methods. However, where applicable, it appears that county leaders highly favor introducing those methods.

There was some opposition to considering the participants in short term projects as 4-H members. This opposition was socially significant in a very large number of counties.

There was relatively heavy opposition to the idea of allowing short term project members to compete with regular members for trips and scholarships. This opposition was relatively uniform throughout the state. (See the county data in table 2A in the appendix.)

Table 2. In these short term projects, some things we have been doing with regular clubs have come into question. Which of these do you think we should use with short term projects?

For use with short term projects	Yes	Neutral	No
Exhibit and compete at county fair	69.7	22.6	7.7
Recognition at regular achievement or awards program	66.0	28.9	5.1
Require keeping and completing records	76.0	19.4	4.6
Consider them 4-H members	35.7	41.8	22.5
Allow competition with regular 4-H members for trips and awards	41.8	29.2	29.0

NEW CLIENTELE FOR 4-H

The proposal to expand the clientele of 4-H has been discussed many years. This proposal takes, essentially, three forms. One suggestion has been to give greater emphasis to the teenage program. Teenagers for many years were limited primarily to taking an ever-expanding list of the traditional projects, more advanced projects in the same subject, or the junior leadership project. The dropout of 4-H members at the beginning of the teen years has always been noticeable and it was thought that new subjects, for example, career explorations, might better serve the needs of the teenager.

Another proposal to expand the clientele of 4-H has been to seek a larger membership among nonfarm youth. The extension of 4-H to the village and city population is an accomplished fact in many counties, to the extent that some of the largest single club and county enrollments now exist in large metropolitan centers. The expansion to town and city population often has involved changes in content. Two projects which have elicited much interest among the urban youth are the bicycle club and the horse project.

Still a third form the expansion proposal has taken has been to lower the minimum age for 4-H from 9, to 7- or 8-year-olds. The proposal is

more recent and has had small support to date. There is much less experience to predict the consequences of such a change than with greater emphasis on teenagers and nonfarm youth population. It could be argued, however, that a much larger share of the methods and content of the traditional 4-H program is appropriate to the 7- and 8-year-old than to the teenage population whether rural or urban.

In considering the attitudes of county leaders toward the three dimensions of expansion in new clientele, the findings are very clear (see table 3). The residence dimension does not seem to make any difference to county leaders, for, given the same age groups, the percentage checking village and city as an area for expansion is almost identical to the percentage checking rural.

The age dimension is the discriminating factor in the responses. Almost three-fourths of the county leaders favor a greater emphasis in reaching more teenagers; furthermore, this has little opposition. Less favorably viewed, but still with over half the county leaders favorable, is expanding numbers in the age 9 to 12 group. Again, the opposition is small in most counties.

However, there were few questions in the entire study which received as high a percentage of unfavorable response as lowering the age limit to include children 7 and 8. Nearly half of the county leaders opposed this type of expansion. Further, among the remaining half, three times as many were neutral as favored this type of expansion.

In considering only the present attitudes of county leaders toward increasing the number of clientele for 4-H, it might be said that expansion in the teenage population is strongly favored in most counties, expansion in the number of 7- and 8-year-olds is definitely viewed unfavorably in most counties, and expansion by reaching more 9- to 12-year-olds is generally favored.

There is no particular reason why 4-H should be the same in every county. In some counties, even lowering the age limit for 4-H membership is viewed favorably. (See table 3A in the appendix.)

COOPERATION WITH OTHER YOUTH AGENCIES

In any community, there is a wide array of organizations devoted wholly or partly to youth. Many of these programs have certain aspects which doubtless have overlapping aims, content, and clientele. The mere fact that a young person gets the same learning opportunity from two different agencies is not inherently undesirable. Some factor may prevent him from learning in one organization, but not in another. Indeed, such "double exposure" may be advantageous in developing his ability to discriminate between differing values. Nevertheless, many people believe such overlapping should be planned if it is allowed to exist at all. Therefore, the coordination and cooperation among youth organizations is open to debate.

Another problem is the necessity for leaders of youth organizations to know what gaps in needed learning experience exist among the organizations --are there important youth problems which no organizations treat?

When organizations cooperate, there is always the danger that weaker organizations will be swallowed by strong ones, and that the program of the smaller organization will become simply a residual or supplement to that of the larger. Cooperation among agencies depends largely on personalities of the leaders, attitudes of those in one organization toward the other, and relative availability of funds.

There is strong opposition to expansion by cooperation of 4-H with most other organizations if this cooperation takes a significant proportion of the agents' time (see table 4). This opposition is spread fairly uniformly throughout the counties (see table 4A in the appendix).

However, greater cooperation with the youth programs in farm organizations and in the agencies which are part of the program of the Department of Agriculture received little opposition. Indeed, about three-fourths of the county leaders expressed favorable attitudes toward having the agent spend much time with these organizations.

The opposition to extended work with schools, churches, scouts, and to a somewhat lesser degree, civic organizations, was very heavy in some counties, and quite heavy statewide. It may be surmised that these organizations are thought to have their own professional help in youth programs, and thus the already over-extended agents should concentrate on programs where such additional professional help is not available.

Table 3. If youth work is expanded in your county who do you think we should aim at?

Groups to include	Yes	Neutral	No
Rural youth, age 9 through 12	55.0	33.3	11.7
Village or urban youth, age 9 through 12	58.4	32.7	8.9
Rural teenagers	71.5	23.8	4.7
Village or urban teenagers	72.1	23.9	4.0
Youth, age 7 and 8	13.1	39.2	47.7

Table 4. Should the agents in your county devote much time to working with the following?

Suggested groups	Yes	Neutral	No
Schools	27.4	39.	33.4
Church youth groups	15.2	44.	40.1
Scouts and Campfire Girls	18.0	46.3	35.7
Future Farmers and Future Homemakers	74.2	17.8	8.0
Youth programs in farm organizations	72.7	19.3	8.0
Youth programs in civic organizations (such as Legion, Rotary)	35.1	43.0	21.9

EXCHANGING WORK BETWEEN AGENTS

Another means of expanding programs in work with youth is through the exchange of work between staff members of nearby counties. This exchange is based on the assumption that agents have different specialties, depending upon training and experience. Specialization suggests that agents could prepare more effective programs if they were not completely tied to counties but rather to areas of program development.

Suppose the agent in County A has most of his training and experience in livestock programs. In nearby County B, another agent has most of his training and experience in grain crop programs. The idea of the exchange of work would permit the agent from County A to conduct educational programs in livestock in County B, while the agent from County B would conduct educational programs on grain crops in County A. Their other responsibilities as county agent would remain the same.

Table 5. Do you feel that agents in your county should spend much time exchanging work (with agents from other counties) in the youth program?

Yes	60.5 percent
Neutral	28.2 percent
No	11.3 percent

The attitude toward the exchange of work in the youth program is highly favored by county leaders. Statewide, well over half favored exchange, and only about 10 percent were opposed (see table 5).

There is little opposition in most of the counties toward the exchange of work (see table 5A in the appendix).

SHOULD YOUTH WORK BE EXPANDED: A SUMMARY ATTITUDE

All of the preceding questions assume that some expansion will take place in youth work. If such expansion takes place, the county leaders have an earlier than usual determination of the direction this expansion should take because of this study. However, this still leaves the question of whether expansion should be attempted at all.

The pattern across the state found over half of the county leaders actively favoring expanding the youth program (see table 6). In a few counties, there was significant opposition (see table 6A in the appendix).

Table 6. Should the youth program in your county be increased?

Yes	58.2 percent
Neutral	34.6 percent
No	7.2 percent

APPENDIX

Table 1A. Short Term Projects (grain, livestock, homemaking, plants)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Grain			Livestock			Homemaking			Plants		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	81.8	18.2	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	10.0	80.0	10.0
CLAY	58.3	33.3	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3
KITTSON	41.7	58.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	36.4	27.3	36.4
MAHNOMEN	37.5	50.0	12.5	62.5	37.5	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
MARSHALL	8.1	81.8	20.0	6.3	63.6	40.0	6.3	62.7	30.9	11.8	28.1	80.0
NORMAN	81.8	18.2	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1
OTTER TAIL	66.7	16.7	16.7	83.3	8.3	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	18.2	54.5	27.3
PENNINGTON	58.3	41.7	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
POLK	90.9	9.1	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	54.5	27.3	18.2
REDLAKE	72.7	18.2	9.1	90.9	9.1	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	45.5	36.4	18.2
ROSEAU	81.8	18.2	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1
TODD	72.7	27.3	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
WADENA	40.0	60.0	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	18.2	72.7	9.1
WILKIN	90.9	9.1	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3
TOTAL	68.8	27.9	3.2	82.6	16.1	3.1	74.2	22.6	3.2	38.2	49.3	12.5

Table 1A. Short Term Projects (grain, livestock, homemaking, plants)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Grain			Livestock			Homemaking			Plants		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	77.8	22.2	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
CHIPPEWA	66.7	33.3	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	58.3	41.7	0.0	41.7	41.7	16.7
COTTONWOOD	50.0	40.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
DOUGLAS	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	33.3	50.0	16.7
GRANT	72.7	27.3	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	27.3	54.5	18.2
JACKSON	66.7	33.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	18.2	72.7	9.1
LAC QUI PA	66.7	25.0	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	83.3	8.3	8.3	33.3	66.7	0.0
LINCOLN	90.9	9.1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.1
LYON	60.0	40.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	30.0	70.0	0.0
MURRAY	81.8	18.2	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	36.4	54.5	9.1
NOBLES	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	44.4	55.6	0.0
PIPESTONE	90.0	10.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
POPE	72.7	27.3	0.0	90.9	0.0	9.1	90.0	10.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0
REDWOOD	50.0	50.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0	12.5	75.0	12.5
ROCK	80.0	20.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	27.3	54.5	18.2
STEVENS	72.7	27.3	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1
SWIFT	45.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	27.3	18.2	90.9	9.1	0.0	20.0	70.0	10.0
TRAVERSE	77.8	22.2	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0
YELLOW MED	44.4	55.6	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0
TOTAL	68.7	29.8	1.5	78.0	19.5	2.5	76.5	21.5	2.0	36.9	55.4	7.7

Table 1A. Short Term Projects (grain, livestock, homemaking, plants)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Grain			Livestock			Homemaking			Plants		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	90.0	10.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0
BROWN	83.3	16.7	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	25.0	58.3	16.7
DODGE	75.0	16.7	8.3	83.3	8.3	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3
FARIBAULT	83.3	16.7	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	16.7	66.7	16.7
FILLMORE	77.8	22.2	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	22.2	77.8	0.0
FREEBORN	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5
GOODHUE	66.7	33.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
HOUSTON	75.0	16.7	8.3	91.7	0.0	8.3	75.0	16.7	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3
LE SUEUR	75.0	16.7	8.3	83.3	8.3	8.3	50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	41.7	8.3
MARTIN	88.9	11.1	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5
MOWER	50.0	40.0	10.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
NICOLLET	57.1	28.6	14.3	71.4	14.3	14.3	57.1	28.6	14.3	28.6	42.9	28.6
OLMSTED	50.0	41.7	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3	41.7	58.3	0.0	16.7	75.0	8.3
RICE	55.6	33.3	11.1	66.7	22.2	11.1	88.9	11.1	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0
STEELE	72.7	27.3	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	90.9	0.0	9.1	54.5	45.5	0.0
WABASHA	45.5	45.5	9.1	66.7	33.3	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	36.4	54.5	9.1
WASECA	75.0	25.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	41.7	41.7	16.7
WATONWAN	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	33.3	58.3	8.3
WINONA	60.0	40.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	90.0	0.0
TOTAL	70.8	25.2	4.0	77.3	18.7	3.9	72.9	23.2	3.9	36.5	53.0	10.5

Table 1A. Short Term Projects (grain, livestock, homemaking, plants)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Grain			Livestock			Homemaking			Plants		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	0.0	80.0	20.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
BENTON	63.6	18.2	18.2	90.9	0.0	9.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.1
CARVER	60.0	40.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
CHISAGO	30.0	70.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2
DAKOTA	60.0	30.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
HENNEPIN	44.4	33.3	22.2	55.6	33.3	11.1	90.0	10.0	0.0	66.7	22.2	11.1
ISANTI	58.3	33.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3	41.7	50.0	8.3
KANDIYOHI	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0
MCLEOD	81.8	18.2	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	30.0	70.0	0.0
MEEKER	36.4	63.6	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	27.3	72.7	0.0
MILLE LACS	37.5	50.0	12.5	75.0	12.5	12.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0
RAMSEY	14.3	14.3	71.4	14.3	14.3	71.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0
RENVILLE	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	27.3	63.6	9.1
SCOTT	80.0	20.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
SHERBURNE	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	40.0	40.0	20.0
SIBLEY	70.0	30.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	70.0	10.0
STEARNS	72.7	27.3	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	36.4	63.6	0.0
WASHINGTON	41.7	41.7	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	75.0	25.0	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0
WRIGHT	81.8	18.2	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	27.3	36.4	36.4
TOTAL	57.1	33.7	9.2	64.5	29.4	6.1	81.4	17.1	1.5	42.8	49.0	8.2

Table 1A. Short Term Projects (grain, livestock, homemaking, plants)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Grain			Livestock			Homemaking			Plants		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	30.0	50.0	20.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	40.0	50.0	10.0
BELTRAMI	36.4	54.5	9.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.1
CARLTON	33.3	58.3	8.3	75.0	25.0	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3
CASS	50.0	30.0	20.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	40.0	50.0	10.0
CLEARWATER	30.0	50.0	20.0	90.9	0.0	9.1	60.0	30.0	10.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
COOK	0.0	30.0	70.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	0.0
CROW WING	30.0	70.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
HUBBARD	55.6	22.2	22.2	77.8	22.2	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	55.6	33.3	11.1
ITASCA	33.3	44.4	22.2	88.9	11.1	0.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	66.7	22.2	11.1
KANABEC	50.0	40.0	10.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0
KOOCHICHIN	30.0	50.0	20.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
LAKE	14.3	28.6	57.1	42.9	57.1	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0
LAKE WOODS	54.5	45.5	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	27.3	63.6	9.1
MORRISON	41.7	58.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	83.3	8.3	8.3	33.3	50.0	16.7
PINE	63.6	18.2	18.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0
ST. LOUIS	27.3	54.5	18.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3
District TOTAL	36.8	44.8	18.4	78.0	17.9	4.2	74.4	22.0	3.6	50.6	40.2	9.1
State TOTAL	61.0	32.0	7.0	75.7	20.6	3.7	76.0	21.2	2.8	40.8	49.7	9.5

Table 1B. Short term projects (outdoor projects, animals other than livestock, safety, manual skills, special interest groups, and earning skills)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Outdoor			Other Animals			Safety			Manual Skills			Special Interest			Earning Skills		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	36.4	54.5	9.1	0.0	70.0	30.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	36.4	54.5	9.1	10.0	60.0	30.0	20.0	60.0	20.0
CLAY	50.0	41.7	8.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	33.3	50.0	16.7	75.0	25.0	0.0
KITTSON	54.5	45.5	0.0	9.1	72.7	18.2	90.9	0.0	9.1	50.0	30.0	20.0	18.2	45.5	36.4	45.5	54.5	0.0
MAHNOMEN	50.0	12.5	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	37.5	50.0	12.5
MARSHALL	36.4	54.5	9.1	0.0	63.6	36.4	72.7	18.2	9.1	27.3	54.5	18.2	9.1	63.6	27.3	36.4	63.6	0.0
NORMAN	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	54.5	27.3	81.8	9.1	9.1	50.0	40.0	10.0	27.3	27.3	45.5	50.0	40.0	10.0
OTTER TAIL	60.0	20.0	20.0	16.7	41.7	41.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	33.3	41.7	25.0	9.1	45.5	45.5	58.3	25.0	16.7
PENNINGTON	41.7	25.0	33.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	75.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	58.3	16.7	8.3	75.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	16.7
POLK	10.0	70.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	54.5	18.2	27.3	81.8	9.1	9.1	18.2	63.6	18.2	27.3	63.6	9.1
REDLAKE	60.0	40.0	0.0	9.1	63.6	27.3	81.8	18.2	0.0	45.5	36.4	18.2	18.2	54.5	27.3	36.4	45.5	18.2
ROSEAU	27.3	45.5	27.3	9.1	54.5	36.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	18.2	63.6	18.2	27.3	63.6	9.1
TODD	36.4	45.5	18.2	10.0	40.0	50.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	10.0
WADENA	36.4	63.6	0.0	9.1	81.8	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	9.1	63.6	27.3	63.6	36.4	0.0
WILKIN	50.0	25.0	25.0	45.5	36.4	18.2	72.7	18.2	9.1	25.0	50.0	25.0	50.0	41.7	8.3	33.3	50.0	16.7
TOTAL	40.4	42.4	17.2	13.2	56.3	30.5	77.4	14.8	7.7	48.7	38.8	12.5	19.1	55.3	25.7	42.8	47.4	9.9

Table 1B. Short term projects (outdoor projects, animals other than livestock, safety, manual skills, special interest groups, and earning skills)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Outdoor			Other Animals			Safety			Manual Skills			Special Interest			Earning Skills		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	12.5	87.5	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5	0.0	25.0	62.5	12.5	50.0	50.0	0.0
CHIPPEWA	50.0	41.7	8.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	83.3	8.3	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3	33.3	66.7	0.0	25.0	41.7	33.3
COTTONWOOD	60.0	30.0	10.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
DOUGLAS	41.7	41.7	16.7	16.7	41.7	41.7	81.8	9.1	9.1	58.3	25.0	16.7	25.0	66.7	8.3	58.3	25.0	16.7
GRANT	54.5	36.4	9.1	18.2	63.6	18.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	54.5	27.3	18.2	27.3	63.6	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1
JACKSON	36.4	45.5	18.2	8.3	25.0	66.7	83.3	8.3	8.3	33.3	58.3	8.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	45.5	27.3	41.7
LAC QUI PA	41.7	58.3	0.0	8.3	58.3	33.3	83.3	8.3	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	25.0	66.7	8.3	41.7	41.7	16.7
LINCOLN	36.4	54.5	9.1	18.2	54.5	27.3	54.5	36.4	9.1	36.4	36.4	27.3	45.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1
LYON	54.5	45.5	0.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	45.5	54.5	0.0
MURRAY	45.5	45.5	9.1	0.0	72.7	27.3	72.7	27.3	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	27.3	54.5	18.2	54.5	36.4	9.1
NOBLES	50.0	50.0	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
PIPESTONE	40.0	50.0	10.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	30.0	70.0	0.0
POPE	45.5	45.5	9.1	9.1	45.5	45.5	90.9	9.1	0.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
REDWOOD	37.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	62.5	25.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	75.0	12.5	12.5	87.5	0.0
ROCK	20.0	50.0	30.0	9.1	54.5	36.4	83.3	8.3	8.3	41.7	33.3	25.0	9.1	72.7	18.2	50.0	41.7	8.3
STEVENS	36.4	36.4	27.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	81.8	18.2	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	27.3	54.5	18.2	45.5	45.5	9.1
SWIFT	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	54.5	45.5	81.8	9.1	9.1	54.5	45.5	0.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	45.5	45.5	9.1
TRAVERSE	20.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	63.6	36.4	0.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	40.0	60.0	0.0
YELLOW MED	60.0	30.0	10.0	11.1	66.7	22.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	11.1	77.8	11.1	90.0	10.0	0.0
TOTAL	42.1	47.2	10.7	14.1	54.3	31.7	81.3	13.8	4.9	46.5	44.0	9.5	22.3	59.9	17.8	46.8	43.3	10.0

Table 1B. Short term projects (outdoor projects, animals other than livestock, safety, manual skills, special interest groups, and earning skills)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Outdoor			Other Animals			Safety			Manual Skills			Special Interest			Earning Skills		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	37.5	37.5	25.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	40.0	50.0	10.0
BROWN	8.3	58.3	33.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	16.7	58.3	25.0	58.3	33.3	8.3
DODGE	33.3	33.3	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	58.3	25.0	16.7	58.3	16.7	25.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	41.7	41.7	16.7
FARIBAULT	25.0	58.3	16.7	0.0	58.3	41.7	75.0	16.7	8.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	16.7	33.3	50.0	25.0	58.3	16.7
FILLMORE	44.4	44.4	11.1	22.2	55.6	22.2	66.7	22.2	11.1	33.3	55.6	11.1	11.1	66.7	22.2	22.2	33.3	44.4
FREEBORN	12.5	87.5	0.0	12.5	75.0	12.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	62.5	12.5	37.5	62.5	0.0
GOODHUE	8.3	75.0	16.7	16.7	33.3	50.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	41.7	41.7	16.7	8.3	58.3	33.3	25.0	58.3	16.7
HOUSTON	25.0	66.7	8.3	9.1	54.5	36.4	90.9	9.1	0.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	50.0	40.0	10.0	54.5	36.4	9.1
LE SUEUR	41.7	41.7	16.7	16.7	41.7	41.7	83.3	8.3	8.3	41.7	50.0	8.3	25.0	50.0	25.0	58.3	41.7	0.0
MARTIN	57.1	14.3	28.6	12.5	62.5	25.0	77.8	11.1	11.1	50.0	37.5	12.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	44.4	22.2	33.3
MOWER	20.0	60.0	20.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	44.4	22.2	33.3
NICOLLET	28.6	28.6	42.9	16.7	83.3	0.0	71.4	0.0	28.6	28.6	28.6	42.9	14.3	57.1	28.6	57.1	42.9	0.0
OLMSTED	66.7	25.0	8.3	33.3	50.0	16.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	66.7	16.7	36.4	36.4	27.3	33.3	50.0	16.7
RICE	44.4	55.6	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	77.8	22.2	0.0	44.4	33.3	22.2	33.3	44.4	22.2	55.6	44.4	0.0
STEELE	50.0	40.0	10.0	36.4	45.5	18.2	90.9	9.1	0.0	81.8	9.1	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0
WABASHA	45.5	36.4	18.2	27.3	45.5	27.3	83.3	8.3	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	54.5	45.5	0.0
WASECA	75.0	16.7	8.3	16.7	33.3	50.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	25.0	41.7	33.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	25.0	50.0	25.0
WATONWAN	66.7	25.0	8.3	16.7	58.3	25.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	8.3	83.3	8.3	50.0	50.0	0.0
WINONA	50.0	40.0	10.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	70.0	0.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	50.0	40.0	10.0
TOTAL	39.1	44.7	16.2	16.6	52.8	30.7	79.6	13.4	7.0	44.3	39.3	16.4	21.3	54.3	24.4	45.0	42.5	12.5

Table 1B. Short term projects (outdoor projects, animals other than livestock, safety, manual skills, special interest groups, and earning skills)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Outdoor			Other Animals			Safety			Manual Skills			Special Interest			Earning Skills		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	70.0	30.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0
BENTON	63.6	27.3	9.1	18.2	36.4	45.5	90.9	9.1	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	9.1	81.8	9.1	83.3	16.7	0.0
CARVER	50.0	30.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	20.0	60.0	20.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
CHISAGO	54.5	36.4	9.1	0.0	50.0	50.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	36.4	54.5	9.1
DAKOTA	80.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
HENNEPIN	80.0	20.0	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0
ISANTI	66.7	33.3	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	41.7	58.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
KANDIYOHI	4.5	53.6	41.8	20.9	15.4	53.6	47.5	2.5	0.0	7.2	71.8	20.9	12.7	35.4	51.8	27.0	2.0	9.9
MCLEOD	60.0	30.0	10.0	36.4	45.5	18.2	63.6	36.4	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	54.5	27.3	18.2
MEEKER	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	70.0	30.0	0.0
MILLE LACS	62.5	25.0	12.5	25.0	37.5	7.5	75.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	37.5	12.5	37.5	62.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
RAMSEY	100.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0
RENVILLE	36.4	36.4	27.3	18.2	63.6	18.2	72.7	27.3	0.0	45.5	18.2	36.4	9.1	54.5	36.4	45.5	36.4	18.2
SCOTT	40.0	40.0	20.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	54.5	18.2	27.3	20.0	70.0	10.0	50.0	41.7	8.3
SHERBURNE	36.4	54.5	9.1	18.2	54.5	27.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	36.4	63.6	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	45.5	36.4	18.2
SIBLEY	54.5	36.4	9.1	10.0	60.0	30.0	90.0	0.0	10.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	10.0
STEARNS	70.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	72.7	27.3	63.6	27.3	9.1	54.5	27.3	18.2	27.3	54.5	18.2	63.6	27.3	9.1
WASHINGTON	50.0	[illegible].3	16.7	50.0	41.7	8.3	66.7	16.7	16.7	41.7	41.7	16.7	45.5	45.5	9.1	41.7	58.3	0.0
WRIGHT	36.4	36.4	27.3	36.4	27.3	36.4	72.7	27.3	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	18.2	45.5	36.4	63.6	36.4	0.0
TOTAL	57.7	31.6	10.7	21.6	55.2	23.2	81.2	16.3	2.5	52.6	37.2	10.2	26.6	56.2	17.2	55.6	37.9	6.6

Table 1B. Short term projects (outdoor projects, animals other than livestock, safety, manual skills, special interest groups, and earning skills)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Outdoor			Other Animals			Safety			Manual Skills			Special Interest			Earning Skills		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	40.0	40.0	20.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	90.9	0.0	9.1	60.0	40.0	0.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	10.0
BELTRAMI	66.7	33.3	0.0	18.2	45.5	36.4	75.0	25.0	0.0	41.7	41.7	16.7	18.2	72.7	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0
CARLTON	41.7	50.0	8.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	16.7	66.7	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7
CASS	45.5	54.5	0.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	54.5	36.4	9.1
CLEARWATER	58.3	25.0	16.7	20.0	50.0	30.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	18.2	27.3	54.5	30.0	50.0	20.0
COOK	80.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0
CROW WING	70.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
HUBBARD	55.6	44.4	0.0	22.2	77.8	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
ITASCA	55.6	44.4	0.0	11.1	77.8	11.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	0.0	44.4	55.6	44.4	44.4	11.1
KANABEC	60.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	90.0	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	66.7	33.3	0.0
KOOCHICHIN	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
LAKE	71.4	28.6	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3	85.7	14.3	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	28.6	71.4	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0
LAKE WOODS	40.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	90.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
MORRISON	58.3	33.3	8.3	33.3	25.0	41.7	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	16.7	16.7	33.3	50.0	16.7	58.3	16.7	25.0
PINE	60.0	40.0	0.0	27.3	54.5	18.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0	18.2	72.7	9.1	50.0	50.0	0.0
ST.LOUIS	75.0	25.0	0.0	45.5	36.4	18.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3
District TOTAL	57.8	36.7	5.4	22.8	53.7	23.5	91.2	7.1	1.8	64.2	28.5	7.3	26.5	54.9	18.5	55.0	38.1	6.9
State TOTAL	47.4	40.6	12.0	17.7	54.4	28.0	82.1	13.2	4.7	50.9	37.9	11.3	23.2	56.2	20.6	49.1	41.7	9.2

Table 1C. Short term projects (understanding adults, personal development, self-understanding, and preparing for marriage)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Adults			Development			Self-Understanding			Marriage		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	63.6	27.3	9.1	80.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
CLAY	72.7	18.2	9.1	91.7	0.0	8.3	54.5	36.4	9.1	36.4	63.6	0.0
KITTSON	36.4	36.4	27.3	54.5	45.5	0.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	36.4	45.5	18.2
MAHNOMEN	87.5	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0	12.5	50.0	37.5	12.5	87.5	12.5	0.0
MARSHALL	7.0	3.0	0.0	9.9	90.0	0.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	4.5	52.7	32.7
NORMAN	80.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	20.0
OTTER TAIL	66.7	16.7	16.7	83.3	0.0	16.7	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	9.1	45.5
PENNINGTON	75.0	16.7	8.3	90.9	9.1	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	50.0	33.3	16.7
POLK	45.5	45.5	9.1	72.7	9.1	18.2	36.4	45.5	18.2	36.4	54.5	9.1
REDLAKE	90.9	9.1	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	45.5	27.3	27.3
ROSEAU	63.6	27.3	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	27.3	[illegible].4	36.4
TODD	63.6	27.3	9.1	80.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1
WADENA	54.5	45.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2	54.5	36.4	9.1
WILKIN	75.0	8.3	16.7	75.0	25.0	0.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	33.3	25.0	41.7
TOTAL	67.1	23.7	9.2	80.0	15.3	4.7	44.6	43.2	12.2	45.0	34.4	20.5

Table 1C. Short term projects (understanding adults, personal development, self-understanding, and preparing for marriage)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Adults			Development			Self-Understanding			Marriage		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	62.5	37.5	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	37.5	50.0	12.5
CHIPPEWA	66.7	16.7	16.7	83.3	16.7	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	33.3	41.7	25.0
COTTONWOOD	55.6	44.4	0.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0
DOUGLAS	75.0	16.7	8.3	75.0	25.0	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	50.0	33.3	16.7
GRANT	54.5	36.4	9.1	90.9	9.1	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	63.6	18.2	18.2
JACKSON	60.0	30.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	27.3	45.5	27.3	40.0	40.0	20.0
LAC QUI PA	66.7	16.7	16.7	58.3	25.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	16.7	50.0	41.7	8.3
LINCOLN	72.7	18.2	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	45.5	36.4	18.2
LYON	70.0	30.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1
MURRAY	81.8	0.0	18.2	90.9	0.0	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	54.5	18.2	27.3
NOBLES	77.8	11.1	11.1	70.0	30.0	0.0	55.6	22.2	22.2	55.6	33.3	11.1
PIPESTONE	60.0	30.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0
POPE	72.7	9.1	18.2	54.5	45.5	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	60.0	10.0	30.0
REDWOOD	42.9	57.1	0.0	71.4	14.3	14.3	71.4	28.6	0.0	71.4	14.3	14.3
ROCK	83.3	8.3	8.3	75.0	16.7	8.3	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7
STEVENS	72.7	18.2	9.1	72.7	9.1	18.2	63.6	18.2	18.2	63.6	18.2	18.2
SWIFT	70.0	20.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	54.5	27.3	18.2
TRAVERSE	60.0	30.0	10.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	33.3	44.4	22.2
YELLOW MED	66.7	22.2	11.1	77.8	22.2	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	66.7	22.2	11.1
TOTAL	67.7	22.6	9.7	74.2	21.7	4.0	55.8	36.5	7.6	51.0	32.0	17.0

Table 1C. Short term projects (understanding adults, personal development, self-understanding, and preparing for marriage)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Adults			Development			Self-Understanding			Marriage		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	72.7	18.2	9.1	80.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	30.0	50.0	20.0
BROWN	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	33.3	50.0	16.7	58.3	41.7	0.0
DODGE	58.3	33.3	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7	58.3	16.7	25.0
FARIBAULT	58.3	41.7	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	41.7	58.3	0.0	33.3	41.7	25.0
FILLMORE	66.7	22.2	11.1	66.7	33.3	0.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	44.4	55.6	0.0
FREEBORN	50.0	50.0	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0
GOODHUE	45.5	18.2	36.4	54.5	36.4	9.1	36.4	36.4	27.3	9.1	72.7	18.2
HOUSTON	33.3	58.3	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3
LE SUEUR	66.7	16.7	16.7	75.0	8.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	33.3	41.7	25.0
MARTIN	44.4	44.4	11.1	77.8	11.1	11.1	25.0	62.5	12.5	12.5	37.5	50.0
MOWER	60.0	30.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0
NICOLLET	71.4	0.0	28.6	57.1	28.6	14.3	71.4	28.6	0.0	14.3	71.4	14.3
OLMSTED	83.3	16.7	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7
RICE	66.7	22.2	11.1	77.8	11.1	11.1	77.8	22.2	0.0	55.6	0.0	44.4
STEELE	63.6	36.4	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	81.8	9.1	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0
WABASHA	81.8	18.2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	45.5	45.5	9.1
WASECA	50.0	33.3	16.7	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	41.7	41.7	16.7
WATONWAN	75.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3
WINONA	66.7	22.2	11.1	77.8	22.2	0.0	44.4	33.3	22.2	22.2	44.4	33.3
TOTAL	62.3	28.6	9.0	75.8	20.2	4.0	51.0	39.8	9.2	42.4	40.4	17.2

Table 1C. Short term projects (understanding adults, personal development, self-understanding, and preparing for marriage)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Adults			Development			Self-Understanding			Marriage		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	77.8	11.1	11.1	88.9	11.1	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	77.8	0.0	22.2
BENTON	40.0	50.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.0	30.0	30.0
CARVER	60.0	40.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
CHISAGO	80.0	20.0	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.1	36.4	36.4	27.3
DAKOTA	60.0	30.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	70.0	20.0	10.0
HENNEPIN	80.0	10.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1
ISANTI	83.3	16.7	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	50.0	41.7	8.3	41.7	50.0	8.3
KANDIYOHI	90.0	10.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	81.8	0.0	18.2	50.0	30.0	20.0
MC LEOD	75.0	25.0	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	54.5	27.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2
MEEKER	80.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	70.0	20.0	10.0
MILLE LACS	87.5	12.5	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	37.5	12.5
RAMSEY	57.1	28.6	14.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0
RENVILLE	66.7	11.1	22.2	77.8	11.1	11.1	33.3	44.4	22.2	33.3	33.3	33.3
SCOTT	72.7	9.1	18.2	90.0	10.0	0.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	63.6	9.1	27.3
SHERBURNE	58.3	41.7	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	9.1
SIBLEY	30.0	70.0	0.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
STEARNS	63.6	36.4	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	36.4	63.6	0.0	18.2	72.7	9.1
WASHINGTON	63.6	18.2	18.2	58.3	33.3	8.3	50.0	50.0	0.0	27.3	63.6	9.1
WRIGHT	45.5	54.5	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1
TOTAL	66.8	27.5	5.7	80.6	15.7	3.7	53.9	37.3	8.8	44.0	39.3	16.8

Table 1C. Short term projects (understanding adults, personal development, self-understanding, and preparing for marriage)

Question: If short term projects become a part of the Extension youth program, which ones, if any, should be offered in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Adults			Development			Self-Understanding			Marriage		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	72.7	27.3	0.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
BELTRAMI	66.7	33.3	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	58.3	41.7	0.0
CARLTON	91.7	8.3	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0
CASS	63.6	27.3	9.1	90.9	9.1	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	36.4	36.4	27.3
CLEARWATER	70.0	10.0	20.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	80.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	30.0	20.0
COOK	80.0	10.0	10.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0
CROW WING	70.0	30.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	50.0	40.0	10.0
HUBBARD	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
ITASCA	80.0	20.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	70.0	10.0
KANABEC	80.0	10.0	10.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0
KOOCHICHIN	88.9	11.1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	44.4	44.4	11.1
LAKE	57.1	42.9	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	71.4	14.3	42.9	28.6	28.6
LAKE WOODS	100.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
MORRISON	66.7	33.3	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	58.3	25.0	16.7	41.7	25.0	33.3
PINE	63.6	18.2	18.2	90.0	10.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
ST. LOUIS	87.5	12.5	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0
District TOTAL	76.6	19.0	4.4	83.0	15.1	1.9	55.8	35.3	9.0	52.2	36.3	11.5
State TOTAL	67.8	24.5	7.7	78.5	17.9	3.7	52.5	38.3	9.2	46.8	36.6	16.6

Table 2A. Methods in short term projects

Question: In these short term projects, some things we have been doing with regular clubs have come into question. Which of these do you think we should use with short term projects.

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Compete Fair			Awards Program			Keep Records			Consider 4-H			Compete Trip		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	66.7	33.3	0.0	81.8	9.1	9.1	60.0	30.0	10.0	22.2	66.7	11.1	44.4	55.6	0.0
CLAY	91.7	8.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	41.7	25.0	33.3	33.3	41.7	25.0
KITTSON	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	9.1	54.5	36.4	33.3	25.0	41.7
MAHNOMEN	50.0	33.3	16.7	66.7	33.3	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	42.9	42.9	14.3	42.9	28.6	28.6
MARSHALL	54.5	27.3	18.2	60.0	30.0	10.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	20.0	10.0	70.0	36.4	9.1	54.5
NORMAN	80.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	40.0
OTTER TAIL	72.7	18.2	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	58.3	8.3	33.3
PENNINGTON	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	41.7	41.7	16.7
POLK	81.8	0.0	18.2	81.8	18.2	0.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	70.0	0.0	30.0
REDLAKE	54.5	36.4	9.1	70.0	30.0	0.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	36.4	45.5	18.2
ROSEAU	72.7	27.3	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	27.3	63.6	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1
TODD	66.7	25.0	8.3	90.9	9.1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	75.0	16.7	8.3
WADENA	70.0	30.0	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	44.4	22.2	33.3	33.3	44.4	22.2
WILKIN	100.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	33.3	41.7	25.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
TOTAL	72.5	20.8	6.7	22.8	25.2	2.0	79.1	17.6	3.4	34.7	35.4	29.9	46.7	24.7	28.7

Table 2A. Methods in short term projects

Question: In these short term projects, some things we have been doing with regular clubs have come into question. Which of these do you think we should use with short term projects.

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Compete Fair			Awards Program			Keep Records			Consider 4-H			Compete Trip		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	44.4	55.6	0.0	88.9	0.0	11.1	77.8	22.2	0.0	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	66.7	11.1
CHIPPEWA	75.0	16.7	8.3	45.5	45.5	9.1	83.3	16.7	0.0	27.3	45.5	27.3	36.4	36.4	0.0
COTTONWOOD	70.0	0.0	30.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
DOUGLAS	70.0	20.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	40.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	10.0	50.0
GRANT	45.5	54.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	45.5	27.3	45.5	18.2	36.4
JACKSON	72.7	18.2	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	27.3	36.4	36.4	36.4	36.4	27.3
LAC QUI PA	58.3	41.7	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	91.7	0.0	8.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	41.7	33.3	25.0
LINCOLN	63.6	18.2	18.2	54.5	45.5	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	36.4	36.4	27.3	27.3	18.2	54.5
LYON	70.0	20.0	10.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.1	36.4	45.5	18.2
MURRAY	72.7	9.1	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	72.7	9.1	18.2	36.4	36.4	27.3	9.1	36.4	54.5
NOBLES	70.0	20.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
PIPESTONE	50.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
POPE	54.5	36.4	9.1	70.0	30.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	27.3	54.5	18.2	45.5	27.3	27.3
REDWOOD	25.0	50.0	25.0	50.0	37.5	12.5	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	71.4	28.6	25.0	25.0	50.0
ROCK	41.7	50.0	8.3	72.7	27.3	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	25.0	58.3	16.7	41.7	25.0	33.3
STEVENS	54.5	36.4	9.1	72.7	9.1	18.2	81.8	9.1	9.1	18.2	63.6	18.2	18.2	36.4	45.5
SWIFT	81.8	18.2	0.0	45.5	54.5	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1
TRAVERSE	90.0	10.0	0.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	11.1	66.7	22.2	40.0	30.0	30.0
YELLOW MED	63.6	27.3	9.1	50.0	40.0	10.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	10.0	70.0	20.0
TOTAL	62.2	27.4	10.4	59.6	33.3	7.1	78.3	16.7	4.9	28.3	49.0	22.7	31.0	34.5	34.5

Table 2A. Methods in short term projects

Question: In these short term projects, some things we have been doing with regular clubs have come into question. Which of these do you think we should use with short term projects.

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Compete Fair			Awards Program			Keep Records			Consider 4-H			Compete Trip		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	66.7	33.3	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	55.6	33.3	11.1	60.0	10.0	30.0
BROWN	45.5	45.5	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	63.6	36.4	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.1	72.7	9.1	18.2
DODGE	58.3	41.7	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3	50.0	25.0	25.0
FARIBAULT	83.3	16.7	0.0	58.3	25.0	16.7	58.3	33.3	8.3	25.0	33.3	41.7	16.7	25.0	58.3
FILLMORE	55.6	44.4	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	66.7	22.2	11.1	33.3	33.3	33.3	22.2	44.4	33.3
FREEBORN	62.5	25.0	12.5	75.0	12.5	12.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	37.5
GOODHUE	75.0	25.0	0.0	18.2	72.7	9.1	75.0	25.0	0.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
HOUSTON	83.3	16.7	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	41.7	33.3	41.7	16.7	41.7
LE SUEUR	66.7	33.3	0.0	50.0	41.7	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	36.4	36.4	27.3
MARTIN	77.8	0.0	22.2	75.0	25.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1	50.0	37.5	12.5
MOWER	40.0	40.0	20.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	50.0
NICOLLET	85.7	14.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7
OLMSTED	33.3	41.7	25.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3	16.7	58.3	25.0
RICE	66.7	22.2	11.1	55.6	44.4	0.0	55.6	22.2	22.2	22.2	33.3	44.4	22.2	33.3	44.4
STEELE	58.3	25.0	16.7	45.5	45.5	9.1	75.0	16.7	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3	54.5	27.3	18.2
WABASHA	75.0	8.3	16.7	63.6	27.3	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	54.5	27.3	18.2	58.3	25.0	16.7
WASECA	91.7	8.3	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3	58.3	16.7	25.0
WATONWAN	72.7	27.3	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	54.5	18.2	27.3	60.0	10.0	30.0
WINONA	70.0	30.0	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	55.6	22.2	22.2	100.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	66.7	26.4	7.0	61.8	33.5	4.7	76.8	19.2	4.0	39.9	38.9	21.2	44.9	26.5	28.6

Table 2A. Methods in short term projects

Question: In these short term projects, some things we have been doing with regular clubs have come into question. Which of these do you think we should use with short term projects.

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Compete Fair			Awards Program			Keep Records			Consider 4-H			Compete Trip		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	80.0	10.0	10.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	60.0	20.0	20.0
BENTON	75.0	25.0	0.0	83.3	8.3	8.3	66.7	16.7	16.7	33.3	58.3	8.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
CARVER	45.5	27.3	27.3	50.0	40.0	10.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	27.3	27.3	45.5	45.5	9.1	45.5
CHISAGO	54.5	45.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	18.2	63.6	18.2	9.1	36.4	54.5
DAKOTA	60.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	30.0
HENNEPIN	77.8	22.2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1	44.4	33.3	22.2
ISANTI	66.7	25.0	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3	25.0	41.7	33.3
KANDIYOHI	75.0	8.3	16.7	81.8	9.1	9.1	66.7	25.0	8.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	66.7	16.7	16.7
MC LEOD	72.7	18.2	9.1	40.0	60.0	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	50.0	33.3	16.7	63.6	9.1	27.3
MEEKER	81.8	9.1	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	66.7	33.3	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7	41.7	41.7	16.7
MILLE LACS	88.9	0.0	11.1	77.8	11.1	11.1	75.0	12.5	12.5	75.0	12.5	12.5	62.5	12.5	25.0
RAMSEY	71.4	28.6	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0	42.9	42.9	14.3	57.1	42.9	0.0	42.9	42.9	14.3
RENVILLE	72.7	9.1	18.2	63.6	36.4	0.0	72.7	9.1	18.2	27.3	0.0	72.7	27.3	9.1	63.6
SCOTT	72.7	18.2	9.1	66.7	33.3	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	55.6	33.3	11.1
SHERBURNE	90.9	9.1	0.0	66.7	22.2	11.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	18.2	54.5	27.3
SIBLEY	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	75.0	16.7	8.3	18.2	63.6	18.2	63.6	36.4	0.0
STEARNS	75.0	25.0	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1	77.8	22.2	0.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	33.3	44.4	22.2
WASHINGTON	58.3	16.7	25.0	75.0	8.3	16.7	66.7	33.3	0.0	16.7	58.3	25.0	33.3	41.7	25.0
WRIGHT	81.8	9.1	9.1	40.0	50.0	10.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	54.5	27.3	18.2
TOTAL	71.6	18.9	9.5	66.5	26.8	6.7	72.0	21.5	6.5	37.2	41.2	21.6	43.2	29.6	27.1

Table 2A. Methods in short term projects

Question: In these short term projects, some things we have been doing with regular clubs have come into question. Which of these do you think we should use with short term projects.

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Compete Fair			Awards Program			Keep Records			Consider 4-H			Compete Trip		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	91.7	0.0	8.3	66.7	16.7	16.7	75.0	16.7	8.3	63.6	9.1	27.3	66.7	8.3	25.0
BELTRAMI	58.3	33.3	8.3	75.0	25.0	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	40.0	30.0	30.0	45.5	18.2	36.4
CARLTON	58.3	25.0	16.7	66.7	33.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	16.7	50.0	33.3	25.0	50.0	25.0
CASS	81.8	9.1	9.1	90.9	9.1	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	45.5	27.3	27.3	36.4	27.3	36.4
CLEARWATER	72.7	18.2	9.1	58.3	25.0	16.7	75.0	16.7	8.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	27.3	27.3	45.5
COOK	80.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	60.0	10.0	30.0
CROW WING	66.7	33.3	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	37.5	50.0	12.5	44.4	44.4	11.1
HUBBARD	77.8	22.2	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	44.4	33.3	22.2	55.6	11.1	33.3
ITASCA	70.0	30.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	55.6	44.4	0.0
KANABEC	90.0	10.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1	55.6	22.2	22.2
KOOCHICHIN	80.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	50.0	20.0	30.0
LAKE	75.0	25.0	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	37.5	25.0	37.5
LAKE WOODS	75.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	33.3	58.3	8.3	33.3	41.7	25.0
MORRISON	75.0	25.0	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	41.7	58.3	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0
PINE	81.8	9.1	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1	75.0	8.3	16.7	36.4	45.5	18.2	30.0	60.0	10.0
ST. LOUIS	100.0	0.0	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	54.5	36.4	9.1
District TOTAL	77.2	18.7	4.1	71.6	24.3	4.1	74.6	21.9	3.6	38.7	42.9	18.4	45.2	29.5	25.3
State TOTAL	69.7	22.6	7.7	66.0	28.9	5.1	76.0	19.4	4.6	35.7	41.8	22.5	41.8	29.2	29.0

Table 3A. New clientele for 4-H

Question: If youth work is expanded in your county who do you think we should aim at?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Rural 9-12			Urban or Village 9-12			Rural Teenage			Urban or Village Teenage			Youth 7-8		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	60.0	30.0	10.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	90.0	10.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	60.0
CLAY	60.0	40.0	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
KITTSON	45.5	45.5	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	9.1	63.6	27.3
MAHNOMEN	62.5	37.5	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	33.3	16.7	50.0
MARSHALL	54.5	36.4	9.1	54.5	45.5	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	18.2	36.4	45.5
NORMAN	50.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	81.8	9.1	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0
OTTER TAIL	45.5	18.2	36.4	30.0	30.0	40.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	55.6	33.3	11.1	12.5	37.5	50.0
PENNINGTON	60.0	20.0	20.0	27.3	54.5	18.2	81.8	18.2	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	10.0	30.0	60.0
POLK	36.4	45.5	18.2	33.3	58.3	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	9.1	18.2	72.7
REDLAKE	70.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	25.0	37.5	37.5
ROSEAU	55.6	33.3	11.1	60.0	30.0	10.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	10.0	50.0	40.0
TODD	72.7	27.3	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	18.2	54.5	27.3
WADENA	40.0	50.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
WILKIN	58.3	16.7	25.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	50.0	33.3	16.7	72.7	27.3	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
TOTAL	54.9	30.6	14.6	53.8	35.2	11.0	73.8	22.1	4.1	71.9	25.3	2.7	13.0	38.4	48.6

Table 3A. New clientele for 4-H

Question: If youth work is expanded in your county who do you think we should aim at?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Rural 9-12			Urban or Village 9-12			Rural Teenage			Urban or Village Teenage			Youth 7-8		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	62.5	37.5	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	12.5	62.5	25.0
CHIPPEWA	63.6	18.2	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	83.3	16.7	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	9.1	27.3	63.6
COTTONWOOD	80.0	10.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
DOUGLAS	63.6	27.3	9.1	60.0	30.0	10.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	9.1	27.3	63.6
GRANT	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	81.8	9.1	9.1	0.0	45.5	54.5
JACKSON	36.4	45.5	18.2	66.7	25.0	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3	81.8	9.1	9.1	16.7	16.7	66.7
LAC QUI PA	45.5	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	83.3	16.7	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	18.2	36.4	45.5
LINCOLN	36.4	18.2	45.5	45.5	18.2	36.4	81.8	9.1	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	0.0	45.5	54.5
LYON	40.0	50.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4
MURRAY	36.4	45.5	18.2	45.5	36.4	18.2	70.0	20.0	10.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	9.1	27.3	63.6
NOBLES	55.6	44.4	0.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	55.6	44.4	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	77.8
PIPESTONE	60.0	30.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	60.0
POPE	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	36.4	27.3	36.4
REDWOOD	37.5	62.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7	50.0	25.0	25.0	12.5	25.0	62.5
ROCK	36.4	45.5	18.2	63.6	36.4	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	0.0	54.5	45.5
STEVENS	63.6	27.3	9.1	72.7	9.1	18.2	81.8	18.2	0.0	81.8	9.1	9.1	27.3	36.4	36.4
SWIFT	45.5	54.5	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0
TRAVERSE	45.5	45.5	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	60.0	20.0	20.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	80.0
YELLOW MED	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4
TOTAL	50.3	36.5	13.2	58.1	30.3	11.6	70.6	25.4	4.1	70.9	25.0	4.1	10.8	36.6	52.6

Table 3A. New clientele for 4-H

Question: If youth work is expanded in your county who do you think we should aim at?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Rural 9-12			Urban or Village 9-12			Rural Teenage			Urban or Village Teenage			Youth 7-8		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	50.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	55.6	33.3	11.1	20.0	20.0	60.0
BROWN	58.3	33.3	8.3	66.7	33.3	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3	41.7	50.0	8.3	25.0	41.7	33.3
DODGE	66.7	8.3	25.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	83.3	0.0	16.7	83.3	16.7	0.0	9.1	54.5	36.4
FARIBAULT	58.3	25.0	16.7	50.0	25.0	25.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	8.3	16.7	75.0
FILLMORE	33.3	55.6	11.1	62.5	37.5	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3
FREEBORN	62.5	37.5	0.0	50.0	37.5	12.5	75.0	25.0	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	12.5	62.5	25.0
GOODHUE	45.5	27.3	27.3	33.3	50.0	16.7	66.7	25.0	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	16.7	50.0	33.3
HOUSTON	58.3	41.7	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	66.7	33.3	0.0	50.0	41.7	8.3	16.7	50.0	33.3
LE SUEUR	27.3	45.5	27.3	72.7	18.2	9.1	50.0	41.7	8.3	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
MARTIN	60.0	30.0	10.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	55.6	33.3	11.1
MOWER	40.0	50.0	10.0	50.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
NICOLLET	37.5	50.0	12.5	44.4	55.6	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7
OLMSTED	58.3	41.7	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	16.7	16.7	25.0	16.7	58.3
RICE	28.6	42.9	28.6	50.0	50.0	0.0	75.0	12.5	12.5	75.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	14.3	85.7
STEELE	54.5	36.4	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	9.1	45.5	45.5
WABASHA	36.4	45.5	18.2	58.3	33.3	8.3	72.7	27.3	0.0	81.8	9.1	9.1	18.2	36.4	45.5
WASECA	66.7	16.7	16.7	41.7	33.3	25.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	16.7	33.3	50.0
WATONWAN	66.7	33.3	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	8.3	75.0	16.7
WINONA	81.8	9.1	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	90.9	9.1	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	9.1	36.4	54.5
TOTAL	53.2	33.8	12.9	55.7	35.0	9.4	70.1	25.0	4.9	67.3	26.8	5.9	15.0	38.5	46.5

Table 3A. New clientele for 4-H

Question: If youth work is expanded in your county who do you think we should aim at?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Rural 9-12			Urban or Village 9-12			Rural Teenage			Urban or Village Teenage			Youth 7-8		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	40.0	40.0	20.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	60.0	10.0	30.0
BENTON	50.0	50.0	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	8.3	33.3	58.3
CARVER	80.0	10.0	10.0	90.0	0.0	10.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
CHISAGO	63.6	36.4	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	18.2	27.3	54.5
DAKOTA	66.7	33.3	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
HENNEPIN	55.6	33.3	11.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	44.4	11.1	70.0	30.0	0.0	11.1	55.6	33.3
ISANTI	58.3	41.7	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	25.0	58.3	16.7
KANDIYOHI	77.8	22.2	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9
MC LEOD	50.0	30.0	20.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	80.0	20.0	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0
MEEKER	63.6	27.3	9.1	54.5	36.4	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	44.4	55.6
MILLE LACS	62.5	37.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5
RAMSEY	16.7	66.7	16.7	71.4	28.6	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0	85.7	0.0	14.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
RENVILLE	45.5	27.3	27.3	45.5	36.4	18.2	63.6	27.3	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	0.0	27.3	72.7
SCOTT	75.0	12.5	12.5	88.9	11.1	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
SHERBURNE	81.8	9.1	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	27.3	45.5	27.3
SIBLEY	54.5	45.5	0.0	45.5	45.5	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
STEARNS	66.7	33.3	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	50.0
WASHINGTON	66.7	16.7	16.7	58.3	25.0	16.7	63.6	27.3	9.1	58.3	33.3	8.3	10.0	40.0	50.0
WRIGHT	8.0	2.0	0.0	3.6	45.4	50.9	17.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	2.0	7.0
TOTAL	61.4	30.7	7.9	65.3	29.0	5.7	70.3	26.0	3.6	74.4	22.1	3.6	14.9	37.0	48.1

Table 3A. New clientele for 4-H

Question: If youth work is expanded in your county who do you think we should aim at?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Rural 9-12			Urban or Village 9-12			Rural Teenage			Urban or Village Teenage			Youth 7-8		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	58.3	33.3	8.3	54.5	36.4	9.1	63.6	27.3	9.1	80.0	20.0	0.0	10.0	60.0	30.0
BELTRAMI	54.5	27.3	18.2	58.3	33.3	8.3	80.0	10.0	10.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	45.5	54.5
CARLTON	50.0	33.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	83.3	16.7	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	8.3	41.7	50.0
CASS	60.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	72.7	27.3	0.0	30.0	30.0	40.0
CLEARWATER	70.0	20.0	10.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	50.0	50.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	0.0	54.5	45.5
COOK	60.0	40.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	90.0	0.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
CROW WING	22.2	77.8	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4
HUBBARD	77.8	22.2	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	77.8	11.1	11.1	77.8	22.2	0.0	11.1	55.6	33.3
ITASCA	33.3	44.4	22.2	22.2	66.7	11.1	77.8	22.2	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	11.1	44.4	44.4
KANABEC	72.7	27.3	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0	83.3	8.3	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	25.0	33.3	41.7
KOOCHICHIN	20.0	60.0	20.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
LAKE	75.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	75.0	12.5	12.5	75.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	50.0
LAKE WOODS	54.5	27.3	18.2	75.0	16.7	8.3	72.7	18.2	9.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	72.7	9.1
MORRISON	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	18.2	18.2	70.0	20.0	10.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	63.6	36.4
PINE	60.0	40.0	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	50.0	41.7	8.3	58.3	33.3	8.3	9.1	36.4	54.5
ST. LOUIS	75.0	8.3	16.7	63.6	27.3	9.1	90.9	9.1	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	36.4	18.2	45.5
District TOTAL	57.0	32.7	10.3	58.3	34.5	7.1	73.8	19.6	6.5	76.6	20.5	2.9	12.1	44.8	43.0
State TOTAL	55.2	33.0	11.7	58.4	32.6	8.9	71.5	23.8	4.6	72.1	24.0	3.9	13.2	39.0	47.8

Table 4A. Cooperation with other youth agencies

Question: Should the agents in your county devote much time to working with the following?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Schools			Church			Scouts			FF and FH			Farm Org.			Civic Org.		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	70.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	0.0	90.9	9.1	72.7	27.3	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	36.4	45.5	18.2
CLAY	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	50.0	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	33.3	50.0	16.7
KITTSON	54.5	36.4	9.1	0.0	54.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	36.4	90.9	0.0	9.1	63.6	9.1	27.3	40.0	30.0	30.0
MAHNOMEN	14.3	57.1	28.6	14.3	57.1	28.6	14.3	71.4	14.3	87.5	12.5	0.0	71.4	14.3	14.3	57.1	28.6	14.3
MARSHALL	27.3	54.5	18.2	0.0	45.5	54.5	27.3	45.5	27.3	63.6	27.3	9.1	72.7	9.1	18.2	36.4	36.4	27.3
NORMAN	27.3	18.2	54.5	20.0	40.0	40.0	9.1	45.5	45.5	63.6	27.3	9.1	90.9	0.0	9.1	36.4	45.5	18.2
OTTER TAIL	18.2	45.5	36.4	25.0	41.7	33.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	63.6	27.3	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	33.3	41.7	25.0
PENNINGTON	45.5	36.4	18.2	18.2	45.5	36.4	10.0	40.0	50.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	50.0	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7
POLK	0.0	40.0	60.0	11.1	44.4	44.4	0.0	55.6	44.4	90.9	0.0	9.1	81.8	9.1	9.1	45.5	27.3	27.3
REDLAKE	9.1	54.5	36.4	0.0	36.4	63.6	30.0	40.0	30.0	81.8	9.1	9.1	90.9	9.1	0.0	36.4	45.5	18.2
ROSEAU	18.2	63.6	18.2	27.3	36.4	36.4	27.3	45.5	27.3	72.7	27.3	0.0	72.7	9.1	18.2	9.1	72.7	18.2
TODD	9.1	72.7	18.2	0.0	63.6	36.4	9.1	54.5	36.4	75.0	16.7	8.3	83.3	8.3	8.3	9.1	63.6	27.3
WADENA	20.0	60.0	20.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	11.1	55.6	33.3	81.8	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0
WILKIN	0.0	41.7	58.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	16.7	41.7	41.7	75.0	8.3	16.7	83.3	8.3	8.3	41.7	41.7	16.7
TOTAL	23.5	46.3	30.2	12.9	49.0	38.1	13.7	53.4	32.9	74.0	18.2	7.8	76.0	76.0	13.0	11.0	35.1	45.0

Table 4A. Cooperation with other youth agencies

Question: Should the agents in your county devote much time to working with the following?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Schools			Church			Scouts			FF and FH			Farm Org.			Civic Org.		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	37.5	25.0	37.5	12.5	37.5	50.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	77.8	22.2	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0
CHIPPEWA	18.2	36.4	45.5	0.0	63.6	36.4	10.0	30.0	60.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	18.2	63.6	18.2
COTTONWOOD	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	70.0	10.0	20.0
DOUGLAS	36.4	27.3	36.4	27.3	36.4	36.4	18.2	45.5	36.4	72.7	18.2	9.1	72.7	9.1	18.2	36.4	36.4	27.3
GRANT	9.1	63.6	27.3	10.0	70.0	20.0	45.5	18.2	36.4	81.8	0.0	18.2	54.5	27.3	18.2	36.4	36.4	27.3
JACKSON	25.0	16.7	58.3	8.3	41.7	50.0	8.3	50.0	41.7	75.0	16.7	8.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	25.0	33.3	41.7
LAC QUI PA	25.0	33.3	41.7	41.7	41.7	33.3	25.0	41.7	41.7	16.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	41.7	33.3
LINCOLN	18.2	54.5	27.3	0.0	36.4	63.6	9.1	54.5	36.4	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	18.2	18.2	36.4	54.5	9.1
LYON	30.0	40.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	10.0
MURRAY	18.2	27.3	54.5	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	54.5	36.4	54.5	45.5	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	36.4	45.5	18.2
NOBLES	50.0	20.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	30.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	30.0	30.0
PIPESTONE	10.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	60.0	10.0	30.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
POPE	27.3	18.2	54.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	18.2	9.1	72.7	81.8	18.2	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	18.2	36.4	45.5
REDWOOD	12.5	50.0	37.5	42.9	28.6	28.6	12.5	25.0	62.5	62.5	25.0	12.5	87.5	12.5	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
ROCK	50.0	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	50.0	0.0	54.5	45.5	83.3	16.7	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	58.3	25.0	16.7
STEVENS	27.3	45.5	27.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	18.2	27.3	54.5	63.6	36.4	0.0	63.6	36.4	0.0	27.3	63.6	9.1
SWIFT	36.4	54.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	9.1	9.1	72.7	18.2	72.7	27.3	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
TRAVERSE	27.3	18.2	54.5	9.1	36.4	54.5	27.3	18.2	54.5	90.0	0.0	10.0	81.8	0.0	18.2	45.5	45.5	9.1
YELLOW MED	40.0	50.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	20.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0	72.7	18.2	9.1	40.0	30.0	30.0
TOTAL	28.9	35.8	35.3	19.1	44.2	36.7	20.6	40.2	39.2	73.8	20.3	5.9	70.4	21.2	8.4	36.0	43.0	21.0

Table 4A. Cooperation with other youth agencies

Question: Should the agents in your county devote much time to working with the following?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Schools			Church			Scouts			FF and FH			Farm Org.			Civic Org.		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1	18.2	72.7	9.1	54.5	36.4	54.5	36.4	9.1	45.5	36.4	18.2	18.2	27.3	54.5
BROWN	25.0	41.7	33.3	8.3	50.0	41.7	16.7	41.7	41.7	66.7	25.0	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
DODGE	16.7	16.7	66.7	0.0	58.3	41.7	8.3	58.3	33.3	75.0	0.0	25.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	33.3	58.3	8.3
FARIBAULT	8.3	50.0	41.7	8.3	33.3	58.3	25.0	8.3	66.7	50.0	16.7	33.3	58.3	16.7	25.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
FILLMORE	44.4	22.2	33.3	0.0	44.4	55.6	0.0	55.6	44.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	77.8	22.2	0.0	22.2	55.6	22.2
FREEBORN	25.0	37.5	37.5	12.5	62.5	25.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	75.0	12.5	12.5	62.5	25.0	12.5	25.0	37.5	37.5
GOODHUE	0.0	54.5	45.5	27.3	18.2	54.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	54.5	9.1	36.4	63.6	18.2	18.2	27.3	36.4	36.4
HOUSTON	8.3	33.3	58.3	8.3	33.3	58.3	8.3	58.3	33.3	66.7	25.0	8.3	75.0	25.0	0.0	33.3	50.0	16.7
LE SUEUR	8.3	41.7	50.0	16.7	41.7	41.7	16.7	41.7	41.7	41.7	33.3	25.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	33.3	50.0	16.7
MARTIN	33.3	0.0	66.7	12.5	12.5	75.0	12.5	12.5	75.0	88.9	0.0	11.1	77.8	22.2	0.0	33.3	22.2	44.4
MOWER	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	30.0	20.0	50.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
NICOLLET	50.0	16.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	57.1	42.9	0.0	71.4	14.3	14.3	42.9	28.6	28.6
OLMSTED	50.0	25.0	25.0	8.3	41.7	50.0	16.7	41.7	41.7	83.3	8.3	8.3	72.7	27.3	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0
RICE	22.2	33.3	44.4	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	12.5	87.5	66.7	11.1	22.2	77.8	11.1	11.1	12.5	25.0	62.5
STEELE	36.4	63.6	0.0	27.3	54.5	18.2	18.2	63.6	18.2	81.8	18.2	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	66.7	16.7	16.7
WABASHA	36.4	36.4	27.3	18.2	36.4	45.5	18.2	72.7	9.1	83.3	16.7	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	63.6	18.2	18.2
WASECA	16.7	58.3	25.0	8.3	58.3	33.3	25.0	50.0	25.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	25.0	41.7	33.3
WATONWAN	50.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	58.3	25.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	25.0	58.3	16.7
WINONA	22.2	44.4	33.3	30.0	30.0	40.0	11.1	66.7	22.2	80.0	10.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
TOTAL	23.5	37.5	39.0	12.6	40.7	46.7	14.1	45.5	40.4	69.5	17.7	12.8	74.9	17.7	7.4	32.3	37.8	29.9

Table 4A. Cooperation with other youth agencies

Question: Should the agents in your county devote much time to working with the following?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Schools			Church			Scouts			FF and FH			Farm Org.			Civic Org.		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	30.0	60.0	10.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	70.0	30.0	0.0
BENTON	41.7	50.0	8.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	83.3	16.7	0.0	75.0	16.7	8.3	33.3	58.3	8.3
CARVER	27.3	27.3	45.5	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	63.6	27.3	9.1	81.8	9.1	9.1	27.3	36.4	36.4
CHISAGO	9.1	45.5	45.5	0.0	45.5	54.5	10.0	70.0	20.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	72.7	27.3	0.0	27.3	63.6	9.1
DAKOTA	30.0	20.0	50.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	0.0	44.4	55.6	80.0	10.0	10.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
HENNEPIN	50.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
ISANTI	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	16.7	66.7	16.7	75.0	25.0	0.0	58.3	33.3	8.3	25.0	66.7	8.3
KANDIYOHI	36.4	45.5	18.2	9.1	63.6	27.3	27.3	45.5	27.3	66.7	33.3	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	36.4	45.5	18.2
MC LEOD	27.3	27.3	45.5	9.1	36.4	54.5	18.2	45.5	36.4	91.7	0.0	8.3	75.0	8.3	16.7	18.2	45.5	36.4
MEEKER	33.3	33.3	33.3	16.7	50.0	33.3	16.7	58.3	25.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	54.5	45.5	0.0
MILLE LACS	25.0	37.5	37.5	0.0	55.6	44.4	33.3	22.2	44.4	66.7	22.2	11.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	66.7	11.1
RAMSEY	66.7	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	42.9	28.6	28.6	66.7	33.3	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3	83.3	16.7	0.0
RENVILLE	18.2	45.5	36.4	9.1	45.5	45.5	9.1	36.4	54.5	63.6	18.2	18.2	36.4	45.5	18.2	27.3	54.5	18.2
SCOTT	54.5	27.3	18.2	18.2	27.3	54.5	27.3	45.5	27.3	58.3	33.3	8.3	81.8	18.2	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1
SHERBURNE	18.2	36.4	45.5	20.0	50.0	30.0	45.5	45.5	9.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	9.1	45.5	45.5
SIBLEY	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	63.6	27.3	27.3	54.5	18.2	75.0	25.0	0.0	66.7	25.0	8.3	18.2	72.7	9.1
STEARNS	45.5	54.5	0.0	9.1	63.6	27.3	18.2	45.5	36.4	81.8	9.1	9.1	72.7	18.2	9.1	27.3	63.6	9.1
WASHINGTON	36.4	18.2	45.5	9.1	36.4	54.5	9.1	27.3	63.6	63.6	18.2	18.2	50.0	41.7	8.3	45.5	9.1	45.5
WRIGHT	11.1	33.3	55.6	0.0	33.3	66.7	20.0	40.0	40.0	90.9	0.0	9.1	81.8	18.2	0.0	20.0	50.0	30.0
TOTAL	30.7	41.7	27.6	13.6	46.2	40.2	20.5	46.5	33.0	75.2	19.4	5.3	68.3	24.9	6.8	32.5	49.0	18.5

Table 4A. Cooperation with other youth agencies

Question: Should the agents in your county devote much time to working with the following?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Schools			Church			Scouts			FF and FH			Farm Org.			Civic Org.		
	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No	Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	45.5	18.2	36.4	16.7	41.7	41.7	30.0	10.0	60.0	58.3	8.3	33.3	72.7	18.2	9.1	27.3	45.5	27.3
BELTRAMI	41.7	25.0	33.3	16.7	66.7	16.7	18.2	81.8	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	41.7	58.3	0.0
CARLTON	33.3	33.3	33.3	16.7	33.3	50.0	16.7	50.0	33.3	83.3	8.3	8.3	75.0	25.0	0.0	33.3	58.3	8.3
CASS	30.0	40.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	70.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	36.4	45.5	18.2
CLEARWATER	16.7	50.0	33.3	9.1	63.6	27.3	0.0	80.0	20.0	83.3	8.3	8.3	72.7	27.3	0.0	27.3	54.5	18.2
COOK	55.6	22.2	22.2	44.4	22.2	33.3	55.6	11.1	33.3	77.8	11.1	11.1	33.3	22.2	44.4	66.7	11.1	22.2
CROW WING	20.0	50.0	30.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	55.6	11.1	33.3
HUBBARD	50.0	12.5	37.5	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	44.4	22.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	33.3	11.1
ITASCA	33.3	22.2	44.4	11.1	44.4	44.4	11.1	33.3	55.6	55.6	22.2	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.2	22.2	22.2	55.6
KANABEC	20.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	44.4	55.6	11.1	44.4	44.4	70.0	30.0	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	33.3	22.2	44.4
KOOCHICHIN	20.0	30.0	50.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	30.0	50.0	20.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	40.0	50.0	10.0
LAKE	0.0	75.0	25.0	25.0	62.5	12.5	0.0	75.0	25.0	62.5	37.5	0.0	87.5	0.0	12.5	37.5	50.0	12.5
LAKE WOODS	25.0	58.3	16.7	16.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	75.0	8.3	91.7	8.3	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
MORRISON	33.3	25.0	41.7	25.0	33.3	41.7	25.0	50.0	25.0	75.0	8.3	16.7	83.3	8.3	8.3	25.0	41.7	33.3
PINE	9.1	27.3	63.6	0.0	36.4	63.6	27.3	9.1	63.6	91.7	0.0	8.3	91.7	8.3	0.0	36.4	36.4	27.3
ST. LOUIS	50.0	40.0	10.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	10.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0
District TOTAL	30.1	35.5	34.3	17.5	44.6	38.0	20.4	48.1	31.5	79.1	12.8	8.1	75.1	17.8	7.1	40.4	40.4	19.3
State TOTAL	27.4	39.1	33.4	15.2	44.7	40.1	18.0	46.3	35.7	74.2	17.8	8.0	72.7	19.3	8.0	35.1	43.0	21.9

Table 5A. Exchange of work in the youth program

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchanging work between counties?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Youth Program Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	55.6	44.4	0.0
CLAY	50.0	33.3	16.7
KITTSON	63.6	18.2	18.2
MAHNOMEN	75.0	25.0	0.0
MARSHALL	63.6	27.3	9.1
NORMAN	54.5	27.3	18.2
OTTER TAIL	36.4	36.4	27.3
PENNINGTON	75.0	16.7	8.3
POLK	54.5	18.2	27.3
REDLAKE	81.8	18.2	0.0
ROSEAU	40.0	40.0	20.0
TODD	25.0	50.0	25.0
WADENA	60.0	40.0	0.0
WILKIN	58.3	25.0	16.7
TOTAL	56.3	29.8	13.9

Table 5A. Exchange of work in the youth program

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchanging work between counties?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Youth Program Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	87.5	12.5	0.0
CHIPPEWA	58.3	33.3	8.3
COTTONWOOD	80.0	20.0	0.0
DOUGLAS	66.7	16.7	16.7
GRANT	54.5	36.4	9.1
JACKSON	41.7	33.3	25.0
LAC QUI PA	41.7	41.7	16.7
LINCOLN	45.5	27.3	27.3
LYON	36.4	45.5	18.2
MURRAY	54.5	27.3	18.2
NOBLES	60.0	40.0	0.0
PIPESTONE	70.0	0.0	30.0
POPE	63.6	27.3	9.1
REDWOOD	37.5	37.5	25.0
ROCK	66.7	33.3	0.0
STEVENS	72.7	27.3	0.0
SWIFT	81.8	0.0	18.2
TRAVERSE	50.0	50.0	0.0
YELLOW MED	80.0	10.0	10.0
TOTAL	59.9	27.7	12.4

Table 5A. Exchange of work in the youth program

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchanging work between counties?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Youth Program Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	80.0	0.0	20.0
BROWN	50.0	41.7	8.3
DODGE	50.0	33.3	16.7
FARIBAULT	66.7	8.3	25.0
FILLMORE	22.2	55.6	22.2
FREEBORN	37.5	62.5	0.0
GOODHUE	33.3	41.7	25.0
HOUSTON	54.5	45.5	0.0
LE SUEUR	25.0	50.0	25.0
MARTIN	57.1	42.9	0.0
MOWER	30.0	60.0	10.0
NICOLLET	83.3	16.7	0.0
OLMSTED	75.0	25.0	0.0
RICE	66.7	33.3	0.0
STEELE	66.7	16.7	16.7
WABASHA	81.8	9.1	9.1
WASECA	66.7	33.3	0.0
WATONWAN	75.0	25.0	0.0
WINONA	80.0	10.0	10.0
TOTAL	57.8	31.7	10.6

Table 5A. Exchange of work in the youth program

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchanging work between counties?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Youth Program Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	80.0	10.0	10.0
BENTON	58.3	33.3	8.3
CARVER	45.5	18.2	36.4
CHISAGO	63.6	27.3	9.1
DAKOTA	44.4	33.3	22.2
HENNEPIN	60.0	40.0	0.0
ISANTI	83.3	16.7	0.0
KANDIYOHI	58.3	16.7	25.0
MC LEOD	63.6	36.4	0.0
MEEKER	50.0	33.3	16.7
MILLE LACS	66.7	33.3	0.0
RAMSEY	85.7	14.3	0.0
RENVILLE	81.8	18.2	0.0
SCOTT	54.5	18.2	27.3
SHERBURNE	72.7	18.2	9.1
SIBLEY	66.7	25.0	8.3
STEARNS	63.6	27.3	9.1
WASHINGTON	58.3	33.3	8.3
WRIGHT	50.0	16.7	33.3
TOTAL	63.1	24.8	12.1

Table 5A. Exchange of work in the youth program

Question: Do you feel that Extension agents in your county should spend much time in exchanging work between counties?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Youth Program Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	72.7	9.1	18.2
BELTRAMI	66.7	33.3	0.0
CARLTON	83.3	16.7	0.0
CASS	36.4	45.5	18.2
CLEARWATER	41.7	50.0	8.3
COOK	80.0	20.0	0.0
CROW WING	60.0	30.0	10.0
HUBBARD	77.8	11.1	11.1
ITASCA	66.7	22.2	11.1
KANABEC	60.0	40.0	0.0
KOOCHICHIN	40.0	40.0	20.0
LAKE	87.5	12.5	0.0
LAKE WOODS	45.5	45.5	9.1
MORRISON	41.7	50.0	8.3
PINE	81.8	9.1	9.1
ST. LOUIS	100.0	0.0	0.0
District TOTAL	64.5	27.8	7.7
State TOTAL	60.5	28.2	11.3

Table 6A. General Expansion of Youth Work

Question: Should the youth program be increased in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northwest District	Work with Youth Yes	Neutral	No
BECKER	72.7	27.3	0.0
CLAY	41.7	50.0	8.3
KITTSON	33.3	44.4	22.2
MAHNOMEN	62.5	37.5	0.0
MARSHALL	81.8	18.2	0.0
NORMAN	60.0	40.0	0.0
OTTER TAIL	45.5	36.4	18.2
PENNINGTON	41.7	50.0	8.3
POLK	63.6	9.1	27.3
REDLAKE	70.0	20.0	10.0
ROSEAU	66.7	22.2	11.1
TODD	58.3	41.7	0.0
WADENA	60.0	40.0	0.0
WILKIN	33.3	50.0	16.7
TOTAL	56.1	35.1	8.8

Table 6A. General Expansion of Youth Work

Question: Should the youth program be increased in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southwest District	Work with Youth Yes	Neutral	No
BIG STONE	55.6	44.4	0.0
CHIPPEWA	63.6	36.4	0.0
COTTONWOOD	70.0	30.0	0.0
DOUGLAS	75.0	16.7	8.3
GRANT	45.5	54.5	0.0
JACKSON	54.5	45.5	0.0
LAC QUI PA	54.5	18.2	27.3
LINCOLN	54.5	27.3	18.2
LYON	30.0	40.0	30.0
MURRAY	36.4	45.5	18.2
NOBLES	70.0	20.0	10.0
PIPESTONE	50.0	50.0	0.0
POPE	54.5	27.3	18.2
REDWOOD	50.0	50.0	0.0
ROCK	41.7	50.0	8.3
STEVENS	54.5	36.4	9.1
SWIFT	45.5	36.4	18.2
TRAVERSE	45.5	27.3	27.3
YELLOW MED	40.0	50.0	10.0
TOTAL	52.2	36.8	10.9

Table 6A. General Expansion of Youth Work

Question: Should the youth program be increased in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Southeast District	Work with Youth Yes	Neutral	No
BLUE EARTH	40.0	50.0	10.0
BROWN	72.7	18.2	9.1
DODGE	75.0	25.0	0.0
FARIBAULT	66.7	33.3	0.0
FILLMORE	44.4	44.4	11.1
FREEBORN	50.0	50.0	0.0
GOODHUE	33.3	50.0	16.7
HOUSTON	63.6	36.4	0.0
LE SUEUR	50.0	50.0	0.0
MARTIN	62.5	37.5	0.0
MOWER	37.5	50.0	12.5
NICOLLET	71.4	28.6	0.0
OLMSTED	66.7	33.3	0.0
RICE	37.5	50.0	12.5
STEELE	41.7	50.0	8.3
WABASHA	63.6	27.3	9.1
WASECA	50.0	50.0	0.0
WATONWAN	36.4	45.5	18.2
WINONA	66.7	22.2	11.1
TOTAL	54.4	39.5	6.2

Table 6A. General Expansion of Youth Work

Question: Should the youth program be increased in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Central District	Work with Youth Yes	Neutral	No
ANOKA	70.0	30.0	0.0
BENTON	63.6	36.4	0.0
CARVER	45.5	45.5	9.1
CHISAGO	36.4	54.5	9.1
DAKOTA	66.7	33.3	0.0
HENNEPIN	60.0	40.0	0.0
ISANTI	50.0	25.0	25.0
KANDIYOHI	66.7	25.0	8.3
MC LEOD	75.0	25.0	0.0
MEEKER	45.5	45.5	9.1
MILLE LACS	25.0	75.0	0.0
RAMSEY	85.7	14.3	0.0
RENVILLE	63.6	18.2	18.2
SCOTT	72.7	27.3	0.0
SHERBURNE	63.6	27.3	9.1
SIBLEY	33.3	66.7	0.0
STEARNS	63.6	36.4	0.0
WASHINGTON	66.7	16.7	16.7
WRIGHT	58.3	33.3	8.3
TOTAL	58.3	35.3	6.4

Table 6A. General Expansion of Youth Work

Question: Should the youth program be increased in your county?

Percent answering for each response

Northeast District	Work with Youth Yes	Neutral	No
AITKIN	63.6	36.4	0.0
BELTRAMI	75.0	16.7	8.3
CARLTON	75.0	25.0	0.0
CASS	72.7	27.3	0.0
CLEARWATER	70.0	30.0	0.0
COOK	90.0	0.0	10.0
CROW WING	80.0	20.0	0.0
HUBBARD	33.3	66.7	0.0
ITASCA	80.0	10.0	10.0
KANABEC	63.6	27.3	9.1
KOOCHICHIN	80.0	20.0	0.0
LAKE	62.5	37.5	0.0
LAKE WOODS	58.3	33.3	8.3
MORRISON	83.3	16.7	0.0
PINE	54.5	36.4	9.1
ST. LOUIS	90.9	9.1	0.0
District TOTAL	71.2	25.3	3.5
State TOTAL	58.2	34.6	7.2

ERIC Clearinghouse
AUG 14 1972
on Adult Education